N-SW
C.1

WELFARE *in* REVIEW

JULY
1964
Vol 2 - No 7

U. S.
DEPARTMENT
OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION,
AND
WELFARE

Welfare
Administration

BOSTON
UNIVERSITY
AUG 21 1964
LIBRARIES

U. S.
DEPARTMENT
OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE

Welfare Administration

Children's
Bureau

Bureau of Family
Services

Office of Aging

Office of Juvenile
Delinquency and
Youth Development

Cuban Refugee
Program Staff

WELFARE in REVIEW

Welfare in Review is the official monthly publication of the Welfare Administration. Statements in Review articles do not necessarily reflect official policies of the Welfare Administration.

Welfare in Review is prepared in the Division of Research, Office of the Commissioner, Welfare Administration. Suggestions or comments should be addressed to the Editor, Welfare in Review, Welfare Administration, 330 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D. C. 20201.

Contents of the publication are not copyrighted; any items may be reprinted but citation of Welfare in Review as the source is requested.

Use of funds for printing this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget July 22, 1963.

Welfare in Review is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Price $2.50 per year; $1 additional for foreign mailing. 30 cents per single copy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE, Secretary

Welfare Administration

ELLEN WINSTON, Commissioner

JOSEPH H. MEYERS, Deputy Commissioner

Volume 2 Number 7

JULY 1964

In This Issue

Page

Implications of the AFDC Eligibility Review..... 1

Case Turnover in Aid to Families With Dependent Children..... 8

Cooperative Research and Demonstration Reports:
- Two Studies of the Effect of the Suitable Home Law..... 11
- Decisions Leading to Institutionalization of the Aged..... 13

Notes..... 7,10,17

Publications of Interest..... 15

Program and Operating Statistics..... 18

Implications of the AFDC Eligibility Review

ELLEN WINSTON
U.S. Commissioner of Welfare

A REVIEW OF EVENTS connected with the AFDC Eligibility Review indicates once again the progress and change one brief year can bring in the public welfare programs.

The primary objective of the review carried out in the first half of 1963 was to determine whether families receiving aid to families with dependent children were eligible for assistance under the eligibility requirements in effect in each State program. Statistically valid samples were drawn in each of the 50 States from caseloads for January through March (a few States' samples extended into April) according to nationally uniform directions.[1] The review was carried out by staff of the Federal, State, and local agencies responsible for administering the AFDC program.

The report of findings[2] marked the end of the review as such, but it represented only the first step in accelerated efforts toward strengthening public assistance administration. Followup on the review and increased efforts to improve social services have permitted no letup in the demanding pace that must be maintained if public assistance programs are to be properly and adequately responsive to the needs of the people served and to the concern for results by the general public. Although only about 4 percent of the children in the United States are receiving AFDC at any given time, one out of six children reaching the age of 18 has received financial assistance and services under the AFDC program at some time during his life.[3] Thus, the administration of this program has implications that can affect the lives of millions of citizens in our society.[4]

Progress in Past Year

What has been accomplished in the past 12 months? First, as of July 1, 1963, Federal policy was revised to require--at a minimum--a redetermination of eligibility of each AFDC case in every State every 6 months. A few States--even before the change in Federal policy--redetermined eligibility more frequently than every 6 months and still do. Most States, however, formerly made such redeterminations only once a year. The current greater frequency of AFDC eligibility determinations is certain to improve their validity, since the majority of the families live in highly marginal and variable circumstances. At the same time, more frequent contacts should assure greater awareness on the part of the caseworker of family needs and result in more readily available services.

This paper was presented at the National Conference on Social Welfare, May 27, 1964, Los Angeles, Calif. It will also appear in the forthcoming book, Social Work Practice, 1964, a collection of selected papers from the conference.

[1] "The Nationwide Study of AFDC," Welfare in Review, July 1963, pp. 6-9.

[2] Vernier, Paul, and Mugge, Robert H.: "Findings of the AFDC Eligibility Review," Welfare in Review, October 1963, pp. 1-11.

[3] Mugge, Robert H.: "Children Receiving AFDC," Welfare in Review, March 1964, pp. 16-17.

[4] Perkins, Ellen J.: "AFDC in Review 1936-1962," Welfare in Review, November 1963, pp. 1-15.

Second, since issuance of the report of findings, Federal and State staff have conducted intensive reviews of administration of the AFDC program in the individual States, beginning with the States in which the review indicated the most serious problems. Federal staff have worked with the States to improve the clarity of State policy, the efficiency of procedures, the adequacy of staff--in numbers and qualifications--and methods for obtaining and recording case information. Periodic reviews are made of corrective steps taken by each State.

Third, a significant new nationwide system to strengthen the administration and supervision of eligibility determinations was initiated beginning September 1, 1963, for AFDC and January 1, 1964, for the adult categories. This system, familiarly referred to as quality control, is discussed in more detail below.

These three activities--the revised Federal policy, the reviews of State AFDC programs in the light of the review findings, and quality control--were directly connected with the eligibility review.

The fourth accomplishment--improvements in social services for public assistance recipients--is directly related not to the review but to the 1962 Public Welfare Admendments. But such improvements also are highly relevant to the review findings and their significance for program administration. Progress made in the provision of a wide range of social services is certain to have its effect in better eligibility determination and improved financial assistance. In turn, valid eligibility determinations and more adequate financial assistance will inevitably improve the effectiveness of social services.

The initial effects of the 1962 amendments authorizing the increased rate of Federal matching for the social services have been beyond expectation. Previously, costs of services provided under the public assistance programs had been shared equally by the Federal Government and the States. Effective September 1, 1962, Federal matching in certain services and in the cost of staff training was increased from 50 percent to 75 percent. Thus, these amendments offered an incentive to the States to increase and improve social services for children and their families. All but one State elected to provide the defined services under the AFDC program and 36 States also elected the adult categories. Reports indicate a wide range of ensuing improvements and developments from sizable increases in staff to provide the services to changing attitudes in respect to the preventive and rehabilitative purpose of the public assistance programs. Four States have completed or are engaged in substantial reorganization in order to give more productive attention to services. At least 15 States have strengthened their quality potentials through the addition of consultants in specialized areas, such as family services, health, legal services, and home economics, and have added program planning staff, including specialists in homemaker service, community planning, and services to the aging. Some States have augmented their educational leave program for professional training; several have reviewed and strengthened their cooperative working relationships with related programs, such as vocational rehabilitation; most are giving greatly increased attention to in-service training programs to increase the ability of staff to provide essential services; and all have issued policy materials to staff in respect to staff responsibility for the provision of services.

As of July 1, 1963, 49 States began the process of studying each AFDC case to identify those with the following problems or needs: (1) home conditions detrimental to the children, (2) children and youth with special health, educational, or behavior problems (including older children in need of preparation for employment or help in securing employment), (3) unmarried parents and their children with special problems, (4) families disrupted by desertion, and (5) families with an adult with potentials for self-support. As these cases are identified, all States have assumed the responsibility to provide at least a beginning scope of services. The study of all cases

will be substantially completed by July 1, 1964, at which time each State will have clearly defined its universe of cases for which various kinds of social services must be provided. The assumption of responsibility for services has led States to examine qualifications of staff, caseloads, supervision, program development, methods of accountability, and the resources available or needed from other agencies. It has also led some States to the reassessment of past experience in the deployment of staff and to more orderly examination of the nature of the problems reflected in the AFDC caseload. Some States have used the demonstration method to learn what services are required to deal effectively with selected problems and the skills that are necessary to provide effective services. States are giving greater attention to leadership and participation in community planning in behalf of public assistance clients and others in the community with similar dependency problems. A few States have reached the point of summarizing findings from the AFDC case studies for use in program planning, in community planning, and for public interpretation.

While acting upon the findings of the eligibility review, it is recognized that some ineligible cases and some incorrect payments will occur in even the most efficiently run programs. First, the determination of human needs, even against the most specific and clear standards, involves human judgment. There will be many instances where equally careful and informed judgments of two people, applied to the same situations, will differ on the decisions to be made. Second, the circumstances of all low-income people change rapidly. It is the essence of life among the very poor that it is eked out from day to day, precariously. A recent survey showed that half of all families leave the AFDC program within 18 months after receiving their first assistance payments. One-third receive assistance less than 12 consecutive months. Thus, as their circumstances change from day to day, so does their eligibility for AFDC. For instance, a day of work may mean that a family which was eligible yesterday is ineligible today and will be eligible soon again. Death of a child or his leaving home may mean that a family budget, which was correct on the last day of the month, represents an overpayment on the first day of the following month.

The AFDC Eligibility Review made visible the problems and conditions of poverty under which children and their families are living for many of the top professional Federal and State staff--those who administer and supervise the public assistance programs and write the governing and guiding policies. People in such positions usually have not carried a caseload in years, if ever. They had to help with the field work to get the study done. Many of those who participated in the review describe it as one of their most rewarding and enlightening experiences--if also one of the most demanding in time and physical energy. Even among those dedicated persons who choose careers of human service, it seems, it is possible to be too long and too far removed from the people they serve always to write realistic policies and to understand what those policies can mean in the lives affected by them. Those staff who went into the field gained or refurbished their knowledge and insight as to what money means in our economy and what lack of it can mean in removing people from participation in the general stream of our society. From their experience, therefore, we hope to realize program developments that will be both more realistic and helpful to children and their families who are grossly deprived socially, culturally, and economically and whose conditions one must see to comprehend or believe.

Quality Control System

A second very important byproduct of the review was the quality control system. What is this method called quality control? How will it contribute to improved program administration?

All quality control systems serve the same basic purposes and provide for the same general type of tools to meet the specified purposes.

The basic purposes of quality control programs are: As a primary objective, to provide a continuous, orderly, and reliable administrative system--based on statistical findings--for evaluating, controlling, and integrating operations and performance to achieve and maintain specified quality standards; as a byproduct, to provide an objective and reliable means of continuing and current accountability for quality of performance and/or product.

To meet these objectives, the quality control system must provide: First, continuous and current statistical information that reliably and promptly reveals problems as and where they occur and that gives a continuing basis for evaluating changes in quality levels; second, prompt action, based on the statistical information, to locate and minimize or correct sources of problems so as to prevent their continued recurrence. Although some activity that is purely corrective of past defects has its place in quality control, such patching up must be clearly subordinate to identifying and correcting, as soon as possible, the sources of defects.

The uniqueness with which these purposes are served by quality control programs lies in the specialized statistical techniques and theories used, in the important degree to which statistical findings guide decisions as to when and where a significant problem exists that needs study and action, and in the degree to which research and program are coordinated in locating and correcting sources of defects.

The current quality control program in public assistance is designed as an initial step in a developing and progressive system. It thus covers only a limited scope of program operation. Even in its initially limited scope, however, the quality control program has the goal and the potential of serving the following purposes:

The standardized specific definitions used in the quality control program of the job to be done in determining eligibility and need for financial services of the agency can serve, immediately and in themselves, to improve performance. Experience with quality control systems has demonstrated that the very development and sharing of specific and common definitions of a job to be done tend to raise performance levels. Such standardized specific definitions can clarify agency expectations and policies, direct performance, and help to bring about statewide uniformity and equity in a way that instructions in more complicated, often less specific, manuals cannot. In the same way, clear and specific identification of defects in performance is in itself the first important help that can be given in correcting and preventing defects.

The standardized definitions of the job to be done that are used in the quality control program can also serve to clarify, unify, and sharpen all agency tools and activities that direct staff performance. Most important among these are agency policies and manuals, day-by-day supervision, and staff development programs. The standard definitions will provide a more specific and objective common base for sharper focus and coordination of all these agency activities. In addition, analysis of problems or "trouble spots" is directed toward locating their source--in policy, in supervision, in staff development programs, or in staff potential. Correction of sources of "trouble spots" should be a primary purpose of policy evaluation, supervision, staff development programs, or even standards for employment in the agency. All of these agency activities and standards can be made more constructive tools for higher quality performance with the specific knowledge made available by quality control programs on areas of needed improvement and results of corrective action taken.

Quality control tools and results, if properly used, will direct and sharpen appreciation of the importance to good service of what may seem to be dry-as-dust facts of so-called "technical" eligibility. Too often the elements of eligibility and need for financial assistance have been considered mere legal or administrative requirements which must be met but which have no significance for

social services and no relevance to professional (social work) job content.

The tools and results of the quality control system should serve to demonstrate the importance and use of each fact required by law or policy in providing good financial and social services to needy people. Or the results of the quality control program should lead to revision and simplification of law or policy. The significance of each of the measured elements is less likely to affect the validity of decisions on eligibility per se than it is to affect the agency's relationship to the needy person and the quality of service--financial or other--that is provided. As the AFDC Eligibility Review showed, in most States the number of defects in eligibility decisions was considerably smaller than the number of defects in determining important facts about families that affect the social services or the financial assistance they receive.

As experience is gained with the quality control program, its scope will be expanded until some day it will cover every important area and aspect of program administration. In addition, as time goes on, the system's tools and methods will periodically be refined and improved. One of the essential elements of every quality control system is continuing evaluation of the system itself to keep it vital and relevant to program changes and needs. Thus, reevaluation is the fourth of the essentials of a system that can be briefly described thus: Define the job to be done; test performance on the job; act to correct sources of any defects; evaluate and reevaluate the system.

Implications for Further Program Development

The review findings also have important implications for the further development of public assistance policies and for casework practice in public assistance.

The review results clearly indicate that, by and large, the intricate procedures that agencies go through in detailed determinations of eligibility are unnecessary. Worse, they may be detrimental to economy of operation, good administration, and effective service, whether that effectiveness is evaluated from the viewpoint of the client or the public. Some States spend more and some spend less time in eligibility determination and redetermination for financial assistance. Nothing in the results of the review or elsewhere indicates that complexity and excessive detail in themselves add anything constructive to the process. Agencies simply get more involved in the details of each family's life, usually without any major effect on decreasing its hazards. On the contrary, overly detailed and punitive policies increase the hazards. Public assistance program operation in some States unfortunately has not yet grown up to the magnitude and nature of the problems presented. Too often what is given under the guise of public assistance is old-fashioned charity rather than financial assistance based on our Nation's democratic principles concerning the basic rights of every individual in our society. As a result, eligibility conditions and assistance standards are complicated to such a degree that the wonder is not that errors occur but that there are not more of them. The giving of financial assistance must be depersonalized if we truly believe in the right to needed aid. The conditions and procedures for providing it must be simplified. The adequacy of the amounts must be improved; they still average less than $30 per month per child, with a high of only $45 and a low of less than $10. The reward will be better service, more efficient and less costly administration of the grants, and fewer pitfalls and risks of error in handling the funds provided for the program.

The review results--and much other information too--also indicate that the traditional use of casework in public assistance must be reevaluated. For many years, almost exclusive emphasis was given to a one-to-one relationship between the caseworker and the individual family. All the facts, all the realities indicate that this almost exclusive emphasis must be abandoned. What are the facts? The AFDC Eligibility Review

indicates that relying on the one-to-one relationship, with inadequate staff to carry the load, leads to increased risk of error. On the other hand, staff shortages and turnover being what they are in the social welfare field, there can be no reasonable expectation in any foreseeable future that the number of needed qualified staff will be available to do a sufficiently higher quality job case by case--even if State legislatures were to appropriate enough administrative funds. Furthermore, the facts indicate that many public assistance recipients suffer from inadequate education and training and unequal opportunity for self-support in our highly industrialized and automated society. Other data indicate the need for elementary housekeeping skills. Children lack developmental experiences. Can such deficiencies be remedied by a one-to-one casework relationship?

The focus increasingly should be for the worker, with even greater skills, to study and classify the families who come to public welfare for help in order to determine their real service needs. For how many may we find that adequate financial assistance, by itself, may be the really essential service? In a recent public forum in Detroit, the audience included at least one AFDC mother. In response to remarks concerning Federal requirements about the caseworker developing a plan for every AFDC child, she asked, "Why do you assume that every mother needs that help? If you give me enough money, I can plan for my own children." And she probably is right. How many others like her are their among AFDC mothers? All the services visualized will not compensate for the too low grants that are characteristic of the AFDC program except in a very few States.

Available figures show that many of the parents and children will need help to seek jobs in the open labor market. They lack education and training. A recent survey showed that 53 percent of all the mothers, 62 percent of all unemployed fathers, and 83 percent of all disabled fathers in AFDC families have 8 years of schooling or less.[5] In a society where a high school education becomes more and more a sine qua non for filling any decently paid job, those with 8 years or less of formal education are not likely to achieve sustained or adequate self-support. But education is not achieved through family and individual casework. For these and other similar broad social and economic problems, public welfare agencies will have to move to group work, to community organization, to utilization of skills in addition to casework, and to greater use of other community resources. In fact, for many family problems--including even those that seem so individual such as poor housekeeping, bad money management, and incompetent child care, the use of group work techniques should be explored. In the public assistance programs and especially in AFDC, the numbers of needy families are so large and the commonness of their problems so striking that the traditional one-to-one approach alone cannot be relied on. It is both slow and expensive. To provide effective services, the needs of families must be skillfully evaluated--in their uniqueness and in their commonness--at point of intake and then the most relevant service provided by the most efficient and effective means and skills. In short, increased flexibility is needed not only in using casework skills but also in employing all other skills and community resources necessary to meet the needs presented.

Because of this reality agencies must also become far more involved in activities that improve the community--the social environment in which families live and children develop. Agencies must concern themselves with housing, for example, because of its effect on people's lives. Every effort must be made to see that high quality day care is available in the community in sufficient quantity,

[5] Mugge, Robert H.: "Education and AFDC," Welfare in Review, January 1964, pp. 1-14.

whether the child's need for such care stems from the mother's employment or from cultural deprivation.

The AFDC review confirmed the importance of building more incentives into public welfare programs, the fact that with constructive services available people can and will move more generally toward self-support, self-care, strengthened family life.

Fortunately, the tools are in large measure available through the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments to the Social Security Act and other recent legislation and through the increased opportunities for training, research, and demonstration.

The most important results of the AFDC Eligibility Review lie in the ability of public welfare agencies to interpret the full significance of the facts revealed and in their determination so to strengthen the AFDC program that it becomes an increasingly effective channel through which deprived children are helped to enter the mainstream of contemporary adult life.

Alaska Demonstration Project

A public welfare demonstration grant of $385,000 has been awarded for a project to aid families who were victims of the Alaska earthquake. The grant, administered by the Bureau of Family Services, will be used in the disaster areas to meet the full need of families with dependent children, including families in need because of the father's unemployment.

About 180 families will receive an average of $47 more per month in assistance payments and an estimated 63 additional families will qualify for aid because of unemployment. The extra funds will help families replace clothing and household goods lost as a result of the disaster and meet other emergency expenses.

The Federal government is paying 100 percent of the cost of the demonstration project, which will be administered by the Alaska State Department of Health and Welfare. Alaska's normal share of the assistance costs attributable to the project ($232,492) is being met from special Federal funds available to finance demonstrations of new approaches, techniques, and methods to improve the effectiveness of public assistance.

Experience with this project is expected to increase public welfare effectiveness in helping people return quickly to their normal lives following a major natural disaster.

Case Turnover in Aid to Families With Dependent Children

JOHN M. LYNCH*

AMONG THOSE who are not familiar with the operation of the program for aid to families with dependent children, there is a tendency to think of the AFDC caseload as a static group. As the following discussion indicates, this conclusion is contradicted by the significantly high turnover rate that actually exists in the program.

The median length of time on assistance for AFDC families is slightly over 2 years, but nearly a third of the families receive aid for less than a year from date of most recent opening. As a result, a considerably larger number of different families are aided at some time during any year than receive assistance in any one month. In 1963, for example, on the average some 960,000 families with dependent children received AFDC monthly. Yet the total number of families aided at some time during the year must have been more than 1-1/4 million. Missing from the almost 970,000 families who received aid in December 1963 were about 315,000 who had been aided a year earlier. And among the almost 970,000 families aided in the last month of 1963 were about 325,000 who had not been aided in December 1962.

Among all the low-income groups receiving federally supported public aid, families with dependent children experience the most highly variable living conditions. By far the largest proportion of the nearly 900,000 case openings and closings during the year occurred because families experienced a material change in their economic circumstances. When cases are closed because of increased income, the improvement in the family's economic circumstances frequently occurs through the efforts of the families themselves, aided and encouraged by staff of the public assistance agencies. For a substantial (but unknown) number of these families, such increased income comes from seasonal or other relatively short term employment.

Monthly case turnover indices[1] reflect the sensitivity of the AFDC program to seasonal fluctuations in economic conditions (table 1). The openings index is high in the winter months and low in the summer months, while the opposite is true for the closings index. In 1963, the number of AFDC cases authorized during the month per 1,000 cases open ranged between a high of 45 in January and December and a low of 33 in June. Conversely, the number of cases closed during the month per 1,000 cases open declined from a high of 44 in May to a low of 31 in December.

Upward net changes of 1 to 14 cases per 1,000 cases open during the month occurred in the late fall and winter months (October through March). In the spring and summer months (April through August) net decreases in caseload ranged between 1 and 10 cases per 1,000 open cases. For September, when

*Chief, Trends and Interprogram Analysis Group, Division of Program Statistics and Analysis, Bureau of Family Services.

1 Such indices relate the number of case openings and closings, as well as the net change in caseload, to a common base, i.e., the total number of cases open during the month. These relationships are expressed as rates per 1,000 cases open during the month. The rate of net change in the caseload shows the direction (plus or minus) of the change as well as its amount.

Table 1. Aid to families with dependent children: Indices of case turnover, by month, January-December 1963

Year and month	Cases authorized	Total cases open during month 1/	Cases closed	Indices of case turnover		
				Cases authorized per 1,000 cases open during month	Cases closed per 1,000 cases open during month	Net change in caseload per 1,000 cases open during month
1963						
January....	44,400	986,400	32,200	45	33	+12
February...	40,300	994,600	32,600	40	33	+7
March.....	40,600	1,003,000	35,500	40	35	+5
April.....	37,400	1,005,000	40,100	37	40	-3
May.....	35,000	1,000,200	43,800	35	44	-9
June.....	32,600	988,800	42,100	33	43	-10
July.....	34,700	981,500	37,900	35	39	-4
August.....	36,800	980,500	37,400	37	38	-1
September..	35,800	978,400	36,500	37	37	0
October....	40,700	982,000	39,100	41	40	+1
November...	38,600	981,500	32,900	39	33	+6
December...	44,700	993,000	30,500	45	31	+14

1/ Represents sum of cases continued from preceding month and cases authorized during month.

Table 2. Public assistance programs: Indices of case turnover, December 1963

Program and number of States	Cases authorized	Total cases open during month 1/	Cases closed	Indices of case turnover		
				Cases authorized per 1,000 cases open during month	Cases closed per 1,000 cases open during month	Net change in caseload per 1,000 cases open during month
Aid to families with dependent children (54 States)..,.....	44,700	993,000	30,500	45	31	+14
Old-age assistance (43 States 2/)	20,700	1,896,300	22,000	11	12	-1
Aid to the blind (43 States 2/)..	1,210	88,660	1,250	14	14	0
Aid to the permanently and totally disabled (42 States 2/)	10,600	413,100	8,800	26	21	+5
General assistance (32 States 3/)	42,500	270,500	29,200	157	108	+49

1/ Represents sum of cases continued from preceding month and cases authorized during month.
2/ Includes all States with separate program for specified type of assistance. States with programs for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled are not required to report separate case turnover data for aged, blind, or disabled recipients.
3/ Includes all States reporting case turnover data.

the openings and closings indices were both 37 per 1,000 open cases, there was no net change in caseload per 1,000 open cases. Considering the openings and closings indices together, the highest total rate of case turnover occurred in October, when openings numbered 41 per 1,000 open cases and the closings index was 40 per 1,000 cases open during the month. In that month, therefore, almost 1 in every 12 AFDC families served by public assistance agencies was involved in case turnover.

Separate case turnover data for the unemployed-parent segment of AFDC are not required of States. However, it is estimated that, on the average, unemployed-parent cases receive assistance substantially less than half the median length of time on assistance for all cases receiving AFDC.[2]

Both the openings and closings indices for AFDC are substantially higher than those for the other federally aided programs (table 2). However, for State-locally financed general assistance programs for which turnover data are reported (32 States), opening and closing indices for December 1963 were 3-1/2 times as high as those for AFDC. The high level of the GA indices of case turnover reflects the much greater incidence in the GA programs of most States of employable persons whose family circumstances permit them to seek and accept employment and, for some States, the limitation of this type of aid to the meeting of emergency needs or to assistance on a short-term basis.

2 See Lynch, John M.: "Effect of Seasonal Variation in Employment Opportunities on Unemployed-Parent Segment of Aid to Families With Dependent Children," Welfare in Review, May 1964.

Clearinghouse for Social Welfare Assignments Abroad

The Welfare Administration has recently expanded services to assist in recruiting social welfare personnel for overseas assignments of various agencies and organizations. A clearinghouse has been established to handle inquiries from social workers seeking assignments abroad and to suggest candidates for such assignments to "user" agencies. Rosters have been set up for candidates and for social workers currently abroad working or studying. Up-to-date information about opportunities for employment or study is collected through continuing liaison with user agencies. These activities are being coordinated with social work and other professional organizations.

In order to get a picture of the number and location of American social workers in foreign assignments, a survey was recently conducted. Returns thus far show over 225 social workers now working in 56 countries. The largest number work for voluntary agencies. Fifty-nine social workers are overseas for the U.S. Government, seven of them for AID and six in the Peace Corps. More than 20 are serving as social welfare advisers with the United Nations social welfare program.

Through the clearinghouse service of the International Office of the Welfare Administration, a project director was recruited for the Peace Corps in Senegal, and a consultant position in Northern Rhodesia was filled for the Council on Social Work Education.

Cooperative Research and Demonstration Reports*

TWO STUDIES OF THE EFFECT OF THE FLORIDA SUITABLE HOME LAW

The passage in 1959 of a Suitable Home Law by the Florida State Legislature raised a number of difficult questions for the Florida State Department of Public Welfare. Accordingly, the State director requested that an independent appraisal be made of the consequences of the Florida statute. Two related studies have resulted, both supported under the Cooperative Research and Demonstration Grants Program currently administered by the Welfare Administration with the cooperation of the Social Security Administration.

The initial study, of one year's duration, was directed by Robert T. Lansdale, then Professor of Social Welfare at Florida State University; the other is a 3-year project, now in its first year, being conducted by the Institute of Social Research of Florida State University under the direction of Lewis M. Killian. The first study consisted of a statistical analysis of cases in the State's aid to families with dependent children (then called aid to dependent children) program which were affected by the Suitable Home Law in its first 2 years of operation. The second is an intensive followup study of a 25 percent sample of cases that withdrew from assistance or withdrew their applications in the same period because of the operation of the statute.

The Florida law provides that a child must be living in a suitable home if he is to receive an AFDC grant. Seven factors are listed, any one of which may cause the home to be considered unsuitable. Six of these relate to physical care and supervision of the child; the seventh deals with the moral environment of the home. To carry out the statute, the Florida State Department established a State Review Team composed of members of the professional staff of the Public Assistance and Child Welfare Divisions in the State office. The 12 district offices through which the federally aided public assistance programs are administered were required to submit to the State Review Team for decision a social data report on every case in which a question of the suitability of the home had been raised.

A total of 16,101 cases, of which 21.7 percent were applications for assistance, were referred to the State Review Team during the first 2 years of operation under the statute. Twenty-two percent of the homes were considered suitable by the team; 38 percent were rated as unsuitable but a trial period was recommended with the children remaining in the home; 40 percent were declared unsuitable and recommendation made for placement of children with a relative or elsewhere if they were to continue to receive AFDC.

A total of 5,350 cases, of which 23 percent were applications, withdrew from the program after the State Review Team decision. In addition, 1,898 cases, or slightly over 10 percent of all families affected by the law, withdrew their application or withdrew from assistance prior to the submission of a report to the State Review Team. Thus, approximately 40 percent of the 17,999 cases affected by the Suitable Home Law in the first 2 years of its operation withdrew from the assistance program.

It is impossible to determine what proportion of the total number of families receiving or applying for AFDC during the 2-year period covered by the study were affected by the statute since an

*Based on reports from projects aided by the Cooperative Research and Demonstration Grants Program administered by the Welfare Administration with the cooperation of the Social Security Administration. Requests for further information on these projects should be directed to the project directors.

unduplicated count of recipients and applicants was unobtainable. The figure of 17,999 families affected may be seen, therefore, only in broad relationship to an average monthly caseload of 25,121 and a total of 34,270 applications received during the 2 years under study.

The Suitable Home Law caused a significant decline in the AFDC caseload in Florida as demonstrated by a drop of slightly over 3,000 cases in the average monthly caseload in 1960-61, the first year the law was fully in effect, as compared with 1958-59, the year immediately preceding the effective date of the statute. Measured another way, the monthly caseload dropped 13.8 percent between June 1959 and June 1961. The recipient rate declined from 49 per 1,000 children under 18 receiving AFDC in June 1959 to 39 per 1,000 in July 1961. Had June 1959 rates prevailed in June 1961, the caseload would have been 30,355, as compared with the actual figure of 23,873 families.

The effect of the Suitable Home Law on the caseload, however, varied among the 10 largest counties and the 12 districts. Although the total AFDC caseload declined 13.8 percent in the 2-year period, the caseload increased by 9.0 percent in one large county and by 5.1 percent in another. In contrast, two other large counties showed a drop in caseload of 31.2 and 30.1 percent respectively. One district showed a 3.2 percent increase in caseload. At the other extreme was a district with a decline of 34.1 percent. The district embracing the large county with the highest rate of increase (9.0 percent) had an overall decline of 2.1 percent.

Approximately 90 percent of the AFDC families affected by the Suitable Home Law were nonwhite. Thus, one effect of the statute was to reduce the proportion of nonwhite families in the AFDC caseload. The proportion of nonwhite cases in the AFDC caseload had been on the increase prior to the passage of the statute, rising from 65.5 percent in June 1952 to 71.8 percent in November 1958. By February 1962, the next month for which data on race were available, the percentage of nonwhite cases had dropped to 66.5 percent.

From an analysis of the age composition of the AFDC caseload in the months of September 1959 and October 1961, it appeared that a higher proportion of families with a small number of children withdrew from the program. In the former month, the average number of children per AFDC family was 2.86 as compared with 2.95 in the latter month. An analysis of the distribution of AFDC families by number of children for these 2 months revealed that the percent of two-child families was lower in October 1961 than in September 1959; the percent of one-, three-, and four-child families was about the same; and both the number and percentage of families with from 6 to 11 children were higher in October 1961 than in September 1959.

While stressing caution about drawing any final conclusions about the effects of withdrawing upon the families involved until an intensive examination of a large number of cases has been made, the report indicates as significant the small number and proportion of the cases withdrawing from the program which had reapplied during the first 2 years. A total of 7,176 cases withdrew their applications or asked that assistance be canceled in the 2-year period; of this number only 475 or 6.6 percent had reapplied by June 30, 1961. These 475 cases represented 10.9 percent of the 4,338 applications received during the 2-year period.

As pointed out above, the State Review Team in 38 percent of the cases recommended a trial period with the children remaining in the home, with supportive agency services to be supplied. The State Welfare Department made a check on the final disposition of 4,197 of the 6,033 families in this group and found that in 80 percent of the cases the situation had improved, resulting in a final affirmative decision with regard to suitability.

The report concludes, "As anticipated from studies of population and economic changes in Florida as well as an analysis of the diversity of social and economic resources among the counties, the impact

of the Suitable Home Law has varied among the 12 districts and 10 largest counties. These differences warrant careful examination. No sweeping generalizations on the social effects of the Suitable Home Law can be made in the light of present quantitative evidence."

The intensive followup study now underway is directed to the 7,200 families that withdrew from the AFDC program in Florida as a result of the Suitable Home Law during the first 2 years the statute was in effect. The objective is to determine specifically and in detail how this withdrawal has affected family life in these cases. The study is concerned with the marital status of the mothers, with their employment status, and with the milieu provided for the children in the absence of AFDC payments. An attempt is also being made to determine the extent to which other assistance--public or private--has had to be provided.

The study will be based on a 25 percent sample, or 1,800 cases, 1,200 of which withdrew after a decision had been made and 600, before a decision had been made. Because the first study showed considerable variation in the impact of the law among the large counties and among the districts, a statewide sample will be employed. A control group of selected active AFDC cases will be used for comparison. It is planned to conduct followup interviews approximately 1 year after the original interview. A final report is anticipated by the fall of 1966. Research Grants Branch, Division of Research

DECISIONS LEADING TO INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF THE AGED

This study, conducted by Hiram J. Friedsam of North Texas State University, is an exploratory effort to examine some of the factors leading to and associated with the decisions which result in admission of older persons to homes for the aged. Although the findings are not generally applicable to populations other than the residents and relatives of the study group--approximately 95 residents and 82 relatives of two sectarian homes for the aged in the Southwest--they tend to confirm a number of commonly held opinions and indicate some interesting directions that further research might take.

Deciding to place an older person in a home for the aged is a complex process involving persons and events, on the one hand, and practical and attitudinal considerations, on the other. The analysis of interview data revealed that homes for the aged are seen as solutions to one or both of two major types of need--for suitable living arrangements and for health care--precipitated by illness, senility, and death or other changes in family life. But this solution is initially regarded as a last resort and to be avoided except in the absence of alternatives. When initial emotional acceptance of a move to a home is found, it occurs on the part of older persons without strong family ties (children) who see the home as satisfying a need for a suitable residence rather than as a place at which they will receive personal care. For both the older residents and their relatives, however emotional reconciliation to the home placement generally tends to increase over time. One of the factors which may facilitate both this attitude and the decision to enter a home in the first place is a degree of assurance provided by membership in particular religious denominations or organizations. The investigators point out that in most instances the decision to enter a home was not a choice from among equally possible alternatives. In the main, the home was perceived as appropriate because it was maintained by the religious group to which the older individual belonged.

Responsibility for decisions leading to entering a home for the aged is perceived differently by the older people, relatives, and others involved.[1] While the residents

1 Detailed findings of this part of the study are reported in Friedsam, Hiram J., and Dick, Harry R.: "An Exploratory Study of Resident and Relative Views of Involvement in Admissions to Two Homes for the Aged," Journal of Health and Human Behavior, Spring 1964, pp. 45-50.

were more likely to see themselves as the sole decision-makers, their relatives were more likely to report that the decision was shared by the resident and others, or made by others alone. In general, older persons without children who are in good health, of independent financial means, and who were living alone or with nonrelatives previous to coming to the home most frequently reported themselves as solely responsible for the decision. On the other hand, the older person who has living children, is in poor health and financially dependent, and who previously lived with relatives or in another institution was more likely to report relatives or others as responsible for the decision.

The nature of the decisions leading to residence in a home was found to be one of the factors having a significant bearing on adjustment to this living arrangement. Both morale and satisfaction with the home were greatest for those residents who were, or felt they were, included in making the decision. Older people who felt that they had been excluded from the decision-making process had lowest morale and satisfaction, while those who claimed sole responsibility had morale and satisfaction scores between these two extremes.

A variety of other preadmission and postadmission factors in their relationship to adjustment also were examined. Although the detailed findings from this part of the study are more fully reported in a separate paper,[2] their implications should be noted here. Primarily, they suggest that older people who have been isolated from close family ties prior to admission to a home tend to react to it more favorably than do those who leave such ties immediately behind them--even if these ties have not been entirely rewarding. Apparently, the institutional setting does not compensate even for the loss of disturbed intimate relationships.

Residential mobility is another preadmission factor which the investigators analyzed intensively. A full report of this phase of the study also has been published.[3] The investigators found that greater residential mobility in the 15 years prior to admission was associated with poorer adjustment in the home.

A considerable number of the Nation's older people are spending their declining years in homes for the aged. Many are waiting to enter these facilities. Others may not now recognize the home as a housing alternative. But as the problem of suitable housing and services for a growing population of elderly increases in social and personal significance, systematic studies such as this can provide the information upon which future research and future decision-making may be based.

June Shmelzer, Office of Aging

---

2 Dick, Harry R., and Friedsam, Hiram J.: "Adjustment of Residents of Two Homes for the Aged," Social Problems, 11:3, Winter 1964, pp. 282-290.

3 Dick, Harry R., and Friedsam, Hiram J.: "Residential Patterns of Aged Persons Prior to Institutionalization," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 26:1, February 1964, pp. 96-98.

Publications of Interest*

Welfare Administration

CHILD WELFARE STATISTICS, 1963. Children's Bureau Statistical Series 75. 1964. 39 pp. Contains statistics on children receiving services from public and voluntary child welfare agencies and institutions, on adoptions in the United States, on personnel in public child welfare agencies, and on expenditures for public child welfare services.

SERVICES FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN. Children's Bureau Folder 38. 1964. 26 pp. Outlines services for crippled children at the State and national levels.

A GUIDE FOR PUBLIC HEALTH NURSES WORKING WITH MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN. By Marian M. Holtgrewe. Children's Bureau, 1964. 49 pp. 25 cents. Explains how the public health nurse can serve as an important liaison between the community or area which she serves and the resources which are available to her in dealing with problems of mentally retarded individuals.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE BUREAU OF FAMILY SERVICES. Bureau of Family Services, 1964. 4 pp. Lists the leaflets, booklets, and reports currently available from the Bureau.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR PROJECTS IN AGING. Three more in the series of pamphlets by the Office of Aging on Federal programs that offer financial assistance for projects in research and demonstration, training, selected services, and facility construction:

No. 4. Pilot Project Contracts and Cooperative Agreements Available Through the Gerontology Branch, Public Health Service (OA No. 703), February 1964.

No. 5. Community Health Services for the Chronically Ill and Aged, Project Grants Program of the Public Health Service (OA No. 704), March 1964.

No. 6. Mental Health Project Grants Program of the National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service (OA No. 705), April 1964.

PLANNING FOR RETIREMENT: A UNIVERSITY-LABOR UNION PROGRAM. By Helen M. Flint and Ted Ruhig. Office of Aging, 1964. 17 pp. 15 cents. Case Study No. 16 in the "Patterns for Progress in Aging" series, this pamphlet describes a preretirement program sponsored jointly by Roosevelt University and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

A RURAL COUNTY CARES FOR ITS AGING. Office of Aging, 1964. 25 pp. 15 cents. Case Study No. 17 in the "Patterns for Progress in Aging" series. Recounts establishment of a successful activity program for older people by a committee of citizens in Aitkin County, Minnesota.

Other Publications

POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES. U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor (88th Congress, 2d session, committee print), April 1964. 304 pp.

THE WAR ON POVERTY: THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964. A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS RELEVANT TO S. 2642. U.S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (88th Congress, 2d session, committee print), 1964. 77 pp.

THE WASTED AMERICANS. By Edgar May. Harper, New York, 1964. 227 pp. $4.50. Discusses the millions who are recipients of public welfare in an affluent society.

INDEX OF INADEQUACY AND INDIGENCY IN THE UNITED STATES. By George K. Wyman. New York State Department of Social Welfare, Albany, October 1963. 14 pp. Limited supply available for free distribution.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING: KEY TO DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1964. 50 pp. Covers the activities of the Manpower Development and Training Program administered jointly by HEW and the Department of Labor.

GROUP METHODS IN THE PUBLIC WELFARE PROGRAM. Edited by Norman Fenton and Kermit T. Wiltse. Pacific Books, Palo Alto, Calif., 1963. 274 pp. $5.50. Accounts of studies on the use of the group process by the State and county welfare departments in California.

*U.S. Government publications for which prices are listed may be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (25 percent discount on lots of 100 or more). Inquiries or orders for other publications should be directed to the publisher or issuing agency.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS IN WELFARE MEDICAL CARE PROGRAMS. By Julia C. Attwood. American Public Welfare Association, Chicago, 1963. 19 pp. 75 cents. Concerned with trends influencing cost and utilization, objectives of controls, principles of establishing and using controls.

RESEARCH STANDARDS AND METHODS FOR SOCIAL WORKERS. By Harris K. Goldstein. Hauser Press, New Orleans, 1963. 323 pp. $8.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO URBAN SOCIOLOGY. Edited by Ernest W. Burgess and Donald J. Bogue, University of Chicago Press, 1964. 673 pp. $12. Documents the last 50 years of research in the field of urban sociology.

PROBLEMS IN MEASURING CHANGE. Edited by Chester W. Harris. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1963. 259 pp. $7.50. Proceedings of a 1962 conference sponsored by the Committee on Personality Development in Youth of the Social Science Research Council, 1962.

SOCIAL GROUPS AS SYSTEM AND SUBSYSTEM. By Odd Ramsoy. Free Press, New York, 1963. 204 pp. $5.75. Study of interrelationships between social groupings.

THE MULTI-PROBLEM FAMILY: A REVIEW AND ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY. By Benjamin Schlesinger. University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1963. 173 pp. $4. The efforts being made in six countries around the world.

THE FAMILY FROM INSTITUTION TO COMPANIONSHIP. By Ernest W. Burgess and others. 3d ed. American Book Co., New York, 1963. 582 pp. $7.15. Study of the family in its sociological frame of reference.

THE FAMILY IN CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE. By William N. Stephens. Holt, New York, 1963. 460 pp. $4.50. Based on a review of the literature on family customs in other societies.

SELECTED BIENNIAL ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE PAPERS, 1963. American Public Welfare Association, Chicago, 1964. 133 pp. $1.50. Twenty-three papers selected from the more than 175 presentations at the round table sessions at APWA's National Biennial Conference in Washington, D.C., December 1963.

PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF SOCIAL WELFARE. By Walter C. Barlow. National Conference on Social Welfare, Columbus, Ohio. 1964. 30 pp. $1. Paper presented at the 90th annual forum at Cleveland, on May 22, 1963, by the president of the Opinion Research Corporation of Princeton, N.J.

SKID ROW IN AMERICAN CITIES. By Donald J. Bogue. Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago, 1963. 521 pp. $6.50. Study describes several distinct groups among inhabitants of skid row.

MEXICO: THE CHALLENGE OF POVERTY AND ILLITERACY. By Ramon Eduardo Ruiz. Huntington Library, San Marino, Calif., 1963. 234 pp. $6. Appraisal of Mexico's struggle for social and economic progress through public education.

NATIONAL DIRECTORY OF PRIVATE SOCIAL AGENCIES. Edited by Helga B. Croner. Social Service Publications, Flushing, N.Y., 1964. More than 5,000 agencies listed by services offered and by city and State. $15 per year for directory and amendment service.

THE SENIOR FORUM: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT RETIREMENT. By Beulah Collins. Fleet, New York, 1964. 316 pp. $4.50.

PROCEEDINGS: SEMINAR ON STATE-LEVEL PLANNING FOR OLDER PEOPLE. National Council on the Aging, New York, 1964. 95 pp. Apply. 1962 seminar sponsored by six national voluntary and public agencies.

SELECTING FOSTER PARENTS: THE IDEAL AND THE REALITY. By Martin Wolins. Columbia University Press, New York, 1963. 223 pp. $6. Criteria to help identify the potentially good foster home.

ADOPTION. By Viola W. Bernard. Child Welfare League of America, New York, 1964. 108 pp. 35 cents. Reprinted from the Encyclopedia of Mental Health. Asks and answers the questions most often posed by prospective adoptive parents, physicians, lawyers, and others.

INFANT CARE IN AN URBAN COMMUNITY. By John and Elizabeth Newson. International Universities Press, New York, 1963. 268 pp. $5. Investigates behavior and attitudes of 709 mothers toward their year-old babies.

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA STANDARDS FOR SERVICES OF CHILD WELFARE INSTITUTIONS. Child Welfare League of America, New York, 1964. 141 pp. $1.25. Another in the League's series on standards for child welfare services.

THE RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT CENTER: CHILDREN, PROGRAMS, AND COSTS. Child Welfare League of America, New York, 1964. 251 pp. $5. Study in depth of 21 residential centers and 2 therapeutic day schools.

WEDNESDAY'S CHILDREN: A STUDY OF CHILD NEGLECT AND ABUSE. By Leontine Young. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1964. 195 pp. $5.95. Examines scope of problem, methods of social work in operation, and the judiciary approach, and suggests new fields of exploration.

REVIEW OF LEGISLATION TO PROTECT THE BATTERED CHILD: A STUDY OF LAWS ENACTED IN 1963. By Vincent De Francis. Children's Division, American Humane Association, Denver, Colo., 1964. 22 pp. 25 cents. Study of the content and philosophy of State legislation in 1963 for the mandatory reporting of child abuse cases. Full legal texts in appendix.

THE NEEDS OF CHILDREN: A SURVEY OF THE NEEDS OF CHILDREN IN THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. Edited by Georges Sicault. Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1963. 175 pp. $3.95. Reports prepared by the United Nations Children's Fund and other agencies affiliated with the United Nations.

REFERENCE GROUPS: EXPLORATION INTO CONFORMITY AND DEVIATION OF ADOLESCENTS. By Muzafer and Carolyn W. Sherif. Harper, New York, 1964. 370 pp. $6. Exploration of the behavior of adolescent boys of three socioeconomic levels.

SALARY STUDY, 1963. By Lydia F. Hylton. Child Welfare League of America, New York, May 1964. 75 pp. $1.25. Study of salaries of selected positions in the 194 voluntary and 13 local public child welfare agencies affiliated with the League.

MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN AND THEIR EDUCATION. By Elmer W. Weber. Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, Ill., 1963. 338 pp. $10.75. Contains list of agencies for the mentally retarded.

ACTION IN THE STATES IN THE FIELDS OF MENTAL HEALTH, MENTAL RETARDATION AND RELATED AREAS. Council of State Governments; Interstate Clearing House on Mental Health, Chicago, 1963. 198 pp. $3. Report on recent financial, legal, and administrative developments in the States' mental health programs.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON MENTAL RETARDATION. 1964. 143 pp. 70 cents. From the conference held at Airlie House, Warrenton, Va., September 18-20, 1963.

STATUS FORCES IN DELINQUENT BOYS. By Martin Gold. Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1963. 229 pp. $6. Study of a matched sample of delinquent and nondelinquent boys and their parents from blue-collar and white-collar families.

WAR AND DELINQUENCY: AN ANALYSIS OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THIRTEEN NATIONS IN WORLD WAR I AND WORLD WAR II. By Walter A. Lunden. Art Press, Ames, Iowa, 1963. 88 pp. $2.50.

Child Welfare Training Grants

Child welfare training grants totaling $1.75 million have been awarded by the Children's Bureau this year. The grants include 265 scholarships for study leading to the master's degree, 56 teaching grants, 19 grants for short-term training projects, and, for the first time, 12 scholarships offering a year of graduate study beyond the M.A. or study leading to a doctoral degree. For the $1.75 million available for these grants in fiscal year 1964, requests from schools of social work totaled nearly $3 million.

This was the second annual award of child welfare training grants, an important part of the intensified effort to increase the number of trained child welfare workers.

Program and Operating Statistics

Public Assistance in April 1964

In April the total number of persons receiving aid under the six public assistance programs[1] was 8.0 million, roughly 10,000 fewer than in March. The net decline--the first in 7 months--was attributable largely to the decrease of 71,100 or 7.8 percent in the number of persons receiving general assistance. In aid to families with dependent children (AFDC), the number of recipients increased 55,200 or 1.3 percent, but this was the smallest increase in 5 months. In the AFDC program, although three-fifths of the States reported increases, most of the national increase in number of recipients was centered in California (22,000), Michigan (23,400), and Ohio (11,400). California initiated payments for children of unemployed parents under its AFDC program in February, and Michigan and Ohio began making such payments in April.

Thirty-seven States reported fewer recipients of old-age assistance in April than in March, and the national total declined by 1,900 or 0.1 percent. Nationally the changes were also small in aid to the blind (a decrease of 100 or 0.1 percent) and in aid to the permanently and totally disabled (a rise of 3,800 or 0.8 percent). Persons aided under medical assistance for the aged numbered 176,400--3,700 more than in March.

Assistance payments for the six programs, including vendor payments for medical care, rose $2,843,000 or 0.7 percent, primarily because of the increases in total payments of $2,727,000 (2.0 percent) in AFDC and $1,852,000 (5.3 percent) in medical assistance for the aged. For general assistance, money payments declined $1,058,000 or 4.2 percent.

State action to raise individual money payments was limited in April. In Oklahoma, as a result of higher allowances for food and drugs and an increase in the monthly maximum on money payments, average money payments rose $2-$3 in old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. When Iowa and Mississippi raised the proportion of requirements met by money payments under AFDC, the average money payment per recipient increased $6 in Iowa and $1 in Mississippi.

[1] Data for specified types of assistance under State programs for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged are classified with data for separate State programs for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, or medical assistance for the aged.

Table 1. Number of recipients of public assistance in the United States, by month, April 1963-April 1964 1/

[Except for general assistance, includes cases receiving only vendor payments for medical care]

Year and month	Old-age assistance 2/	Medical assistance for the aged 2/	Aid to the blind 2/	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled 2/	Aid to families with dependent children			General assistance 4/	
					Families	Total recipients 3/	Children	Cases	Recipients
	Number of recipients								
1963									
April.....	2,211,016	127,412	98,588	448,448	977,739	4,004,001	2,995,563	370,000	940,000
May.....	2,202,570	129,493	98,471	459,229	972,498	3,976,422	2,978,752	350,000	856,000
June.....	2,198,962	136,220	98,404	461,537	962,566	3,934,391	2,951,882	330,000	778,000
July.....	2,191,307	140,159	98,096	466,524	957,629	3,910,539	2,932,495	325,000	769,000
August.....	2,194,275	148,473	98,140	470,174	954,957	3,912,137	2,933,228	326,000	767,000
September..	2,191,593	144,021	97,954	472,162	951,818	3,902,605	2,930,806	322,000	754,000
October....	2,196,429	157,707	98,178	475,493	957,024	3,920,794	2,945,425	326,000	766,000
November...	2,194,387	152,919	97,843	477,472	953,325	3,933,339	2,954,844	322,000	765,000
December...	2,193,564	150,162	97,794	479,315	969,084	3,988,961	2,993,326	353,000	870,000
1964									
January....	2,190,004	156,769	97,709	482,446	983,114	4,059,302	3,042,042	376,000	951,000
February...	2,188,506	160,471	97,617	486,286	999,970	4,141,730	3,098,336	374,000	933,000
March.....	2,188,610	172,736	97,760	490,156	1,013,313	4,206,817	3,148,698	374,000	914,000
April.....	2,186,711	176,416	97,631	493,935	1,023,539	4,262,041	3,188,256	359,000	843,000
	Percentage change from previous month								
1963									
April.....	-0.2	+8.4	-0.3	+0.6	+0.2	+0.3	+0.3	-4.4	-7.9
May.....	-.4	+1.6	-.1	+2.4	-.5	-.7	-.6	-5.6	-8.9
June.....	-.2	+5.2	-.1	+.5	-1.0	-1.1	-.9	-5.7	-9.2
July.....	-.3	+2.9	-.3	+1.1	-.5	-.6	-.7	-1.5	-1.1
August.....	+.1	+5.9	(5/)	+.8	-.3	(5/)	(5/)	+.3	-.3
September..	-.1	-3.0	-.2	+.4	-.3	-.2	-.1	-1.2	-1.7
October....	+.2	+9.5	+.2	+.7	+.5	+.5	+.5	+1.5	+1.5
November...	-.1	-3.0	-.3	+.4	+.1	+.3	+.3	-1.1	+.3
December...	(6/)	-1.8	-.1	+.4	+1.1	+1.4	+1.3	+9.6	+13.7
1964									
January....	-.2	+4.4	-.1	+.7	+1.4	+2.0	+1.6	+6.5	+9.3
February...	-.1	+2.4	-.1	+.8	+1.7	+2.0	+1.8	-.7	-2.1
March.....	(5/)	+7.6	+.1	+.8	+1.3	+1.6	+1.6	0	-2.0
April.....	-.1	+2.1	-.1	+.8	+1.0	+1.3	+1.3	-3.9	-7.8

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Represents data for recipients of the specified type of assistance under separate State programs and under State programs for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 3/ Includes as recipients the children and 1 or both parents or 1 caretaker relative other than a parent in families in which the requirements of at least 1 such adult were considered in determining the amount of assistance. 4/ Partly estimated. Excludes Idaho and Indiana for all months and Nebraska beginning November 1963; data not available. 5/ Increase of less than 0.05 percent. 6/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.

Table 2. Amount of public assistance payments in the United States, by month, April 1963-April 1964 1/

[Except for general assistance, includes vendor payments for medical care]

Year and month	Total 2/	Old-age assistance 3/	Medical assistance for the aged 3/	Aid to the blind 3/	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled 3/	Aid to families with dependent children	General assistance 4/
	Amount of assistance						
1963							
April	$399,177,000	$170,660,914	$26,441,100	$8,044,895	$34,071,522	$125,534,737	$25,264,000
May	399,392,000	171,464,001	28,870,692	8,049,211	34,529,977	124,204,346	23,215,000
June	390,918,000	169,395,345	26,592,866	8,040,888	34,522,707	121,770,120	21,298,000
July	390,482,000	168,081,430	28,426,914	8,043,679	35,105,811	120,616,307	21,397,000
August	391,217,000	167,109,786	29,642,387	8,009,157	35,424,031	121,184,131	21,350,000
September	391,487,000	168,441,224	28,202,295	7,972,555	35,667,016	121,842,043	21,112,000
October	399,662,000	169,526,665	31,851,824	8,109,060	36,287,194	123,437,104	21,728,000
November	393,541,000	168,016,864	28,966,274	7,990,500	35,943,882	122,804,815	21,241,000
December	402,553,000	168,979,916	30,212,901	8,021,730	36,301,352	126,649,272	23,996,000
1964							
January	407,263,000	168,975,680	30,929,987	8,013,048	36,599,609	128,918,392	25,664,000
February	414,663,000	171,345,730	31,757,790	8,076,895	37,336,550	132,718,951	24,986,000
March	424,754,000	172,520,773	34,679,610	8,140,935	38,241,308	136,836,208	25,155,000
April	427,597,000	171,440,998	36,532,021	8,167,521	38,683,146	139,562,947	24,097,000
	Percentage change from previous month						
1963							
April	+0.7	+0.5	+11.0	(5/)	+1.9	+0.2	-4.2
May	+.1	+.5	+9.2	+.1	+1.3	-1.1	-8.1
June	-2.1	-1.2	-7.9	-.1	(5/)	-2.0	-8.3
July	-.1	-.8	+6.9	(6/)	+1.7	-.9	+.5
August	+.2	-.6	+4.3	-.4	+.9	+.5	-.2
September	+.1	+.8	-4.9	-.5	+.7	+.5	-1.1
October	+2.1	+.6	+12.9	+1.7	+1.7	+1.3	+2.9
November	-1.5	-.9	-9.1	-1.5	-.9	-.5	-2.2
December	+2.3	+.6	+4.3	+.4	+1.0	+3.1	+13.0
1964							
January	+1.2	(5/)	+2.4	-.1	+.8	+1.8	+7.0
February	+1.8	+1.4	+2.7	+.8	+2.0	+2.9	-2.6
March	+2.4	+.7	+9.2	+.8	+2.4	+3.1	+.7
April	+.7	-.6	+5.3	+.3	+1.2	+2.0	-4.2

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Total exceeds sum of columns because of inclusion of vendor payments for medical care from general assistance funds and from special medical funds; data for such expenditures partly estimated for some States. 3/ Represents data for payments to recipients of the specified type of assistance under separate State programs and under State programs for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 4/ Partly estimated. Excludes Idaho and Indiana for all months and Nebraska beginning November 1963; data not available. 5/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent. 6/ Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

Table 3. Old-age assistance: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, April 1964 1/

[Includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients		Percentage change from--			
		Total amount	Average	March 1964 in--		April 1963 in--	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total 2/	2,186,711	$171,440,998	$78.40	-0.1	-0.6	-1.1	+0.5
Ala.	109,619	7,469,360	68.14	+.3	-.4	+4.2	+5.7
Alaska 3/	1,386	4/ 114,211	82.40	-1.1	-8.1	-.1	+2.0
Ariz.	13,359	843,223	63.12	+.1	+1.7	-.4	+2.0
Ark.	57,869	3,570,105	61.69	+.2	(5/)	+2.4	-2.7
Calif.	272,402	29,490,154	108.26	+.4	-2.1	+3.3	+3.0
Colo. 2/	48,976	4,946,945	101.01	-.2	+.3	-.6	-5.3
Conn.	7,932	711,831	89.74	+.2	+9.9	-10.3	+3.3
Del.	1,234	87,920	71.25	+1.2	+14.2	+12.6	+35.3
D. C.	2,390	201,724	84.40	-1.4	-11.0	-12.9	-26.1
Fla. 3/	71,595	4,749,220	66.33	+.2	+.3	+1.6	+5.4
Ga.	91,852	5,114,079	55.68	(5/)	-2.2	-.4	+3.1
Guam 6/	166	5,021	30.25	---	---	---	---
Hawaii 3/	1,148	76,589	66.72	-.5	-17.0	-3.1	+12.3
Idaho	4,766	346,534	72.71	-.9	-2.3	-11.0	-13.1
Ill. 3/	58,908	5,184,229	88.01	-1.1	-.9	-6.0	-4.1
Ind.	23,218	1,859,460	80.09	-.3	-.2	-4.1	+4.7
Iowa	28,980	2,594,439	89.53	-.4	-3.1	-4.5	-1.2
Kans.	22,172	1,832,286	82.64	-1.4	-9.5	-10.3	-17.8
Ky. 3/	56,472	3,510,696	62.17	+.4	+3.5	+4.9	+9.4
La.	130,087	11,034,642	84.83	+.1	+.6	+1.8	+2.6
Maine 3/	11,163	939,286	84.14	-.2	+.3	-.7	+6.5
Md. 3/	9,497	692,072	72.87	+.5	+1.7	+1.9	+3.6
Mass.	54,827	5,038,647	91.90	-.5	+1.4	-4.3	+.7
Mich.	50,020	4,249,591	84.96	-.1	+.3	-2.0	+5.7
Minn.	43,145	4,803,024	111.32	-.1	-3.0	-1.2	+2.7
Miss.	74,390	2,911,454	39.14	-.2	-.5	-3.0	+8.0
Mo.	103,838	6,950,790	66.94	-.3	-.7	-2.2	-.1
Mont.	5,566	400,273	71.91	-.6	-.5	-5.3	-1.2
Nebr.	12,632	1,137,203	90.03	-.6	-3.5	-2.7	+9.5
Nev.	2,555	227,541	89.06	(5/)	+1.4	+.4	-.4
N. H.	4,467	450,902	100.94	-.7	-1.0	-2.5	-1.8
N. J.	13,992	1,120,196	80.06	(7/)	-.3	-24.3	-36.5
N. Mex. 3/	10,785	800,881	74.26	+.3	+.1	+.3	-7.6
N. Y.	56,430	5,293,257	93.80	+.2	+1.0	+.1	+4.7
N. C.	43,715	2,580,545	59.03	-.1	(7/)	-1.7	+3.5
N. Dak.	5,453	463,430	84.99	-.6	-5.6	-6.3	-7.2
Ohio	85,291	7,262,134	85.15	-.8	+1.4	-.5	(5/)
Okla. 3/	83,442	7,997,558	95.85	-.2	-6.9	-.5	+3.7
Oreg.	11,361	771,503	67.91	-.8	-.9	-24.8	-41.0
Pa.	47,060	3,635,067	77.24	-.2	+5.0	-3.4	-1.8
P. R.	32,563	302,421	9.29	-.4	-2.0	-6.1	-6.0
R. I. 3/	5,969	507,772	85.07	-.5	-.9	-1.0	+1.5
S. C.	26,319	1,441,987	54.79	-.5	+2.4	-3.6	+1.3
S. Dak.	7,317	602,118	82.29	-.4	+.3	-5.6	-4.3
Tenn.	45,883	2,398,135	52.27	-.4	-1.7	-5.3	+2.1
Tex.	228,999	16,055,407	70.11	+.1	+.4	+2.2	+2.0
Utah	5,119	366,257	71.55	-.7	+2.4	-8.4	-6.0
Vt. 3/	5,460	461,814	84.58	-.2	-.1	-.5	+1.2
V. I.	474	16,196	34.17	+.2	+.2	-6.3	-11.2
Va.	13,429	832,720	62.01	+.1	+.9	-1.4	+3.3
Wash.	34,063	2,903,983	85.25	-.6	+5.2	-19.7	-26.9
W. Va.	14,791	727,903	49.21	-.7	-.2	-6.1	-1.4
Wis.	29,617	3,139,422	106.00	-.3	+2.0	-3.8	+9.0
Wyo.	2,548	216,841	85.10	-1.1	-2.3	-3.2	-3.2

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Includes 3,799 recipients aged 60-64 in Colorado and payments of $334,273 to these recipients. Such payments were made without Federal participation. 3/ Represents aid to the aged under program for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 4/ In addition, supplemental payments of $17,623 from general assistance funds were made to 30 recipients. 5/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent. 6/ Data for March; April data not available. 7/ Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

Table 4. Medical assistance for the aged: Recipients and payments for recipients, by State, April 1964 1/

State	Number of recipients 2/	Payments for recipients		Percentage change from March 1964	
		Total amount	Average	Number	Amount
Total.....	176,416	$36,532,021	$207.08	+2.1	+5.3
Ala.....	259	72,146	278.56	-8.5	-10.2
Ark.....	2,549	128,345	50.35	+5.8	-11.6
Calif.....	26,997	7,973,416	295.34	-2.7	-3.3
Conn.....	6,028	3/ 1,303,183	216.19	+11.0	+22.4
Dist. of Col.....	309	93,811	303.60	-54.4	-64.1
Fla. 4/.....	509	197,660	388.33	+23.2	+24.7
Guam 5/.....	130	2,276	17.51	---	---
Hawaii 4/.....	500	130,602	261.20	+7.3	-2.2
Idaho.....	1,880	251,210	133.62	-4.7	-6.6
Ill. 4/.....	986	454,917	461.38	+7.3	+3.0
Iowa.....	2,447	287,500	117.49	+57.2	+47.8
Kans.....	1,922	3/ 311,676	162.16	+24.2	+44.1
Ky. 4/.....	6,914	236,937	34.27	+4.0	+16.9
La.....	576	121,632	211.17	+17.3	+40.9
Maine 4/.....	449	110,131	245.28	+20.4	+5.8
Md. 4/.....	10,255	365,169	35.61	+8.1	+16.6
Mass.....	25,949	3/ 4,502,490	173.51	+1.7	+9.2
Mich.....	5,253	1,942,499	369.79	+.1	+11.2
N. H.....	1,149	53,674	46.71	+8.9	-24.3
N. J.....	5,157	3/ 1,277,380	247.70	+4.8	+17.9
N. Y.....	34,552	3/ 11,276,414	326.36	+3.5	+6.6
N. Dak.....	6/ 1,051	3/ 229,985	218.82	+2.0	-3.0
Okla. 4/.....	1,014	152,974	150.86	-8.9	-8.3
Oreg.....	3,542	506,215	142.92	-1.9	-3.0
Pa.....	8,183	1,989,009	243.07	+3.7	+3.5
P. R.....	3,422	98,122	28.67	+9.4	+4.6
S. C.....	1,082	220,620	203.90	+2.5	+17.1
Tenn.....	5,046	250,283	49.60	+13.9	+14.0
Utah.....	2,142	251,271	117.31	+12.1	+10.7
Vt. 4/.....	134	31,473	234.87	(7/)	(7/)
V. I.....	131	3,225	24.62	(7/)	(7/)
Va.....	596	106,973	179.48	+102.0	+73.6
Wash.....	9,938	1,427,768	143.67	+4.7	+11.2
W. Va.....	5,344	161,126	30.15	-32.3	-21.1
Wyo.....	21	9,909	(7/)	(7/)	(7/)

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Persons for whom vendor payments were made during the report month. 3/ Includes money payments not subject to Federal participation as follows: $883 in Connecticut, $10,566 in Kansas, $101,300 in Massachusetts, $8,254 in New Jersey, $52,276 in New York, and $2,243 in North Dakota. 4/ Represents medical assistance for the aged under program for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled and medical assistance for the aged. 5/ Data for March; April data not available. 6/ Includes an unknown number of cases receiving only money payments. 7/ Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 recipients; percentage change on fewer than 100 recipients.

Table 5. Aid to the blind: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, April 1964 1/

/Includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments/

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients		Percentage change from--			
		Total amount	Average	March 1964 in--		April 1963 in--	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total 2/.....	97,631	$8,167,521	$83.66	-0.1	+0.3	-1.0	+1.5
Ala.....	1,739	100,488	57.78	+.6	+3.1	+3.3	+24.2
Alaska 3/.....	105	8,030	76.48	+1.9	+1.3	-2.8	+1.8
Ariz.....	828	59,947	72.40	-1.0	-.2	-5.3	-5.7
Ark.....	1,977	132,587	67.06	+.1	-.4	0	-2.0
Calif. 2/.....	12,555	1,635,239	130.25	+.5	+.7	+1.3	+3.1
Colo.....	257	22,299	86.77	0	-2.2	-3.4	-4.8
Conn.....	317	35,991	113.54	+1.9	-2.6	+7.1	+5.9
Del.....	295	23,828	80.77	-.3	+1.2	+3.9	+10.5
D. C.....	197	14,464	73.42	+1.5	+2.1	+4.2	+6.9
Fla. 3/.....	2,572	174,351	67.79	+.3	+.9	+.7	+4.9
Ga.....	3,162	182,960	57.86	(4/)	-2.5	+2.2	+4.5
Guam 5/.....	6	132	(6/)	---	---	---	---
Hawaii 3/.....	80	7,339	91.74	(6/)	(6/)	(6/)	(6/)
Idaho.....	132	9,773	74.04	+2.3	+3.2	+.8	+7.1
Ill. 3/.....	2,590	232,762	89.87	-1.1	-.6	-7.7	-11.3
Ind.....	1,785	150,038	84.05	-.5	+.3	-1.9	+4.0
Iowa.....	1,216	123,816	101.82	-.8	-.4	-6.6	-5.2
Kans.....	507	43,225	85.26	+.6	-2.7	-6.8	-10.1
Ky. 3/.....	2,432	172,300	70.85	+.1	+2.0	+2.7	+4.9
La.....	2,815	228,553	81.19	-.6	-.4	+1.1	+1.8
Maine 3/.....	351	29,856	85.06	-3.6	-2.6	-14.4	-10.7
Md. 3/.....	404	32,332	80.03	-.7	+1.3	-2.7	+11.3
Mass.....	2,272	310,250	136.55	-1.1	+.7	+1.1	+6.3
Mich.....	1,683	146,089	86.80	-.6	-.7	+.8	-7.5
Minn.....	1,078	120,474	111.76	-.4	-4.0	+4.4	-2.1
Miss.....	3,003	133,639	44.50	+.2	+.7	-6.7	+10.4
Mo. 2/.....	4,568	342,600	75.00	-.1	-.1	-2.6	+4.3
Mont.....	264	22,337	84.61	+.4	+4.0	-6.4	+2.6
Nebr.....	670	68,626	102.43	+.1	-3.8	-.9	+7.4
Nev.....	168	19,500	116.07	-.6	-2.3	+3.7	+4.8
N. H.....	256	26,616	103.97	-1.9	-1.3	-1.2	-.7
N. J.....	947	82,432	87.05	+.6	+3.0	-1.4	-1.3
N. Mex. 3/.....	339	30,766	90.76	-.6	+.6	-2.6	+17.0
N. Y.....	3,196	362,528	113.43	-1.0	-1.1	-1.6	+6.4
N. C.....	5,060	331,253	65.47	(7/)	+.1	(4/)	+6.6
N. Dak.....	79	6,227	78.82	(6/)	(6/)	(6/)	(6/)
Ohio.....	3,384	286,680	84.72	-.4	+4.4	-1.3	+1.3
Okla. 3/.....	1,687	205,435	121.78	-.6	+1.7	-1.2	+5.0
Oreg.....	409	34,296	83.85	-1.0	+2.8	+2.8	+10.1
Pa. 2/.....	17,858	1,336,990	74.87	-.1	+.7	+.2	-1.1
P. R.....	1,509	12,631	8.37	-1.2	-1.4	-7.4	-6.1
R. I. 3/.....	102	8,956	87.80	0	+1.8	-2.9	-4.6
S. C.....	1,765	110,963	62.87	+1.1	+.9	+4.9	+6.3
S. Dak.....	127	8,793	69.24	-2.3	-1.5	-7.3	-2.2
Tenn.....	2,254	117,095	51.95	-.9	-.9	-5.8	+.5
Tex.....	4,810	333,905	69.42	-.2	-.1	-5.4	-4.1
Utah.....	172	13,840	80.47	0	+6.1	-3.9	+4.7
Vt. 3/.....	114	8,665	76.01	+.9	-6.0	+3.6	+19.2
V. I.....	15	513	(6/)	(6/)	(6/)	(6/)	(6/)
Va.....	1,152	78,749	68.36	+1.4	-1.3	+.9	+4.4
Wash.....	667	63,247	94.82	-.7	+2.7	+2.3	-5.8
W. Va.....	830	39,840	48.00	-.7	-.5	-5.3	-4.4
Wis.....	813	78,410	96.45	0	-.8	-4.0	-7.8
Wyo.....	58	4,866	83.90	(6/)	(6/)	(6/)	(6/)

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Data include recipients of payments made without Federal participation and payments to these recipients as follows: California, $8,391 to 54 recipients; Missouri, $50,912 to 674 recipients; and Pennsylvania, $936,630 to 12,685 recipients. 3/ Represents aid to the blind under program for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 4/ Increase of less than 0.05 percent. 5/ Data for March; April data not available. 6/ Average payments not computed on base of fewer than 50 recipients; percentage change on fewer than 100 recipients. 7/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.

Table 6. Aid to the permanently and totally disabled: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, April 1964 1/

[Includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients		Percentage change from--			
		Total amount	Average	March 1964 in--		April 1963 in--	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total.....	493,935	$38,683,146	$78.32	+0.8	+1.2	+10.1	+13.5
Ala.....	14,340	658,970	45.95	+1.1	+.2	+7.4	+7.9
Alaska 2/.....	141	13,523	95.91	+3.7	+4.1	(3/)	(3/)
Ariz.....	2,776	187,203	67.44	+3.2	+2.8	+73.5	+71.6
Ark.....	9,167	523,010	57.05	+.3	-.8	+7.2	+7.3
Calif.....	46,746	5,317 128	113.75	+3.4	-.2	+50.5	+55.4
Colo.....	6,035	448,793	74.37	+.4	+.4	+3.3	+3.8
Conn.....	7,128	577,440	81.01	+2.2	+19.0	+12.8	+49.2
Del.....	425	31,126	73.24	-2.7	-.9	-3.4	-.9
Dist. of Col.....	3,024	232,348	76.83	-.5	-1.7	+1.6	+.4
Fla. 2/.....	15,896	1,124,732	70.76	+1.0	+.4	+10.4	+12.3
Ga.....	25,801	1,519,828	58.91	+.5	-2.4	+1.2	+4.9
Guam 4/.....	59	1,528	25.90	---	---	---	---
Hawaii 2/.....	1,055	118,636	112.45	-.1	-13.8	+3.6	+17.5
Idaho.....	2,712	154,163	56.84	+1.3	+1.3	+13.3	+14.8
Ill. 2/.....	27,966	2,598,116	92.90	+.3	+.7	-1.5	-6.7
Ind.....	1,004	115,771	115.31	+5.7	+10.4	+723.0	+1074.9
Iowa.....	1,105	91,208	82.54	+1.4	+1.6	+20.8	+23.0
Kans.....	4,494	464,020	103.25	(5/)	-5.9	+3.7	+11.4
Ky. 2/.....	9,797	757,038	77.27	+1.2	+3.9	+5.6	+13.7
La.....	18,790	1,085,099	57.75	+.7	+.5	+4.0	+5.1
Maine 2/.....	2,224	196,426	88.32	-.4	+.5	-5.7	-2.5
Md. 2/.....	7,285	567,928	77.96	+.8	+2.1	+11.8	+24.5
Mass.....	11,580	1,688,630	145.82	+.9	+4.4	+7.6	+14.7
Mich.....	7,440	789,625	106.13	+1.5	+2.1	+13.3	+14.0
Minn.....	3,395	206,797	60.91	+.7	-.2	+10.6	+10.4
Miss.....	17,043	742,286	43.55	+1.6	+1.5	+15.1	+46.4
Mo.....	14,559	1,014,131	69.66	-.3	-1.2	-2.0	+.7
Mont.....	1,268	99,716	78.64	-.4	-.5	+.7	+3.9
Nebr.....	2,458	230,278	93.69	+.7	+1.5	+13.5	+30.1
N. H.....	570	64,697	113.50	+2.2	+2.2	+10.5	+13.5
N. J.....	8,271	779,602	94.26	+1.0	-.5	+4.5	+4.7
N. Mex. 2/.....	3,548	303,693	85.60	+.7	+.8	+12.8	+20.4
N. Y.....	35,132	4,481,079	127.55	-.1	+1.1	+1.0	+5.2
N. C.....	21,553	1,492,781	69.26	+.5	+1.1	-.5	+4.4
N. Dak.....	1,425	163,992	115.08	+.6	+2.3	+11.7	+18.2
Ohio.....	18,653	1,421,758	76.22	+1.0	+1.7	+8.0	+1.7
Okla. 2/.....	12,879	1,421,502	110.37	+1.1	+3.0	+10.6	+16.1
Oreg.....	7,743	489,061	63.16	+.2	+1.5	+56.1	+5.9
Pa.....	19,615	1,297,024	66.12	+.6	+.2	+.5	+2.4
P. R.....	21,368	184,407	8.63	-.4	-.1	-2.5	-2.3
R. I. 2/.....	2,740	248,713	90.77	-.1	-.1	+5.5	+9.0
S. C.....	8,507	487,206	57.27	+.5	+6.0	+2.7	+6.0
S. Dak.....	1,101	76,452	69.44	+.6	+.6	+.5	+4.3
Tenn.....	12,525	627,651	50.11	+.2	(5/)	+4.4	+9.9
Tex.....	9,128	523,180	57.32	+1.1	+1.0	+10.9	+10.3
Utah.....	4,644	328,304	70.69	-.9	+2.7	(6/)	-1.9
Vt. 2/.....	1,057	86,024	81.39	+1.7	-7.1	+12.1	+34.1
V. I.....	91	3,050	33.52	(7/)	(7/)	(7/)	(7/)
Va.....	6,672	440,747	66.06	+.3	+1.3	+3.2	+5.4
Wash.....	18,378	1,179,316	64.17	-.6	+6.1	+89.6	+31.5
W. Va.....	6,212	320,181	51.54	-.9	+1.5	-10.0	-3.6
Wis.....	5,796	654,226	112.88	+1.0	+2.5	+9.5	+16.2
Wyo.....	614	53,003	86.32	-2.1	+.7	+1.8	+1.4

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Represents aid to the permanently and totally disabled under program for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 3/ Program not in operation in April 1963. 4/ Data for March; April data not available. 5/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent. 6/ Increase of less than 0.05 percent. 7/ Percentage change not computed on fewer than 100 recipients.

Table 7. Aid to families with dependent children: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, April 1964 1/

/Includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments/

State	Number of families	Number of recipients		Payments to recipients			Percentage change from--			
					Average per--		March 1964 in--		April 1963 in--	
		Total 2/	Children	Total amount	Family	Recipient	Number of recipients	Amount	Number of recipients	Amount
Total 3/ 4/.	1,023,539	4,262,041	3,188,256	$139,562,947	$136.35	$32.75	+1.3	+2.0	+6.4	+11.2
Ala. 4/.....	22,571	92,540	73,006	1,084,289	48.04	11.72	+.2	+.2	+1.1	+1.4
Alaska 4/.....	1,314	4,700	3,564	162,544	123.70	34.58	-1.2	-.7	+7.7	+8.6
Ariz. 4/.....	9,815	42,046	31,749	1,200,448	122.31	28.55	-.4	-.7	+3.5	+3.5
Ark.....	7,085	28,908	21,841	489,257	69.06	16.92	+1.1	+.5	+4.2	+.8
Calif. 3/ 4/..	119,191	486,521	363,953	21,763,188	182.59	44.73	+4.8	+3.1	+38.0	+37.9
Colo.....	10,356	40,442	31,319	1,495,979	144.46	36.99	+.6	+.7	+4.7	+4.5
Conn. 3/.....	14,592	58,343	41,912	2,918,649	200.02	50.03	+1.2	+11.7	+15.7	+34.3
Del. 3/.....	2,660	12,407	9,307	271,897	102.22	21.91	-1.5	-2.1	+12.6	+10.6
D. C.....	3,993	18,969	15,217	621,960	155.76	32.79	-.3	(5/)	-2.5	-1.5
Fla.....	27,307	103,124	82,923	1,657,270	60.69	16.07	(6/)	-.1	-1.7	-5.6
Ga.....	16,078	62,753	47,434	1,430,547	88.98	22.80	+.4	+.3	-3.5	-5.1
Guam 7/.....	134	671	557	8,715	65.04	12.99	---	---	---	---
Hawaii 3/.....	3,286	14,053	10,468	475,572	144.73	33.84	+.2	-5.4	-.7	+8.6
Idaho.....	2,650	10,353	7,541	406,416	153.36	39.26	-1.4	-1.4	+4.8	+1.0
Ill. 3/ 4/....	57,114	269,254	205,480	11,886,446	208.12	44.15	-.6	+.4	-2.6	-2.8
Ind. 4/.....	11,984	48,114	35,851	1,407,267	117.43	29.25	+1.3	+2.8	-.5	+3.7
Iowa.....	10,218	40,846	29,725	1,569,738	153.62	38.43	-.1	+17.6	-4.1	+.4
Kans. 3/ 4/...	8,082	33,826	25,889	1,239,713	153.39	36.65	-.2	-4.3	+20.0	+17.9
Ky. 4/.....	20,197	77,290	55,512	1,937,411	95.93	25.07	+.9	+1.9	-4.9	-4.8
La. 4/.....	23,471	102,408	77,497	2,367,530	100.87	23.12	+.6	+.9	+4.2	+4.8
Maine.....	5,515	19,994	14,817	581,681	105.47	29.09	0	-.2	-10.4	-12.3
Md. 3/ 4/.....	16,343	70,996	54,616	2,311,861	141.46	32.56	+.4	+.1	+16.6	+18.9
Mass. 3/.....	23,667	88,325	65,925	4,354,051	183.97	49.30	+1.4	+4.1	+14.6	+21.3
Mich. 3/ 4/...	38,221	152,581	111,428	5,199,747	136.04	34.08	+18.1	+8.5	+20.3	+10.7
Minn. 4/.....	12,861	47,061	36,828	2,372,496	184.47	50.41	+1.7	-.2	+11.1	+12.0
Miss.....	20,814	82,544	65,684	875,561	42.07	10.61	+1.0	+12.1	+2.0	+20.6
Mo. 4/.....	26,279	106,807	80,844	2,569,848	97.79	24.06	+.2	+.3	+2.8	+1.7
Mont.....	1,833	7,261	5,573	254,650	138.93	35.07	+1.2	+1.3	+1.3	+4.4
Nebr.....	3,623	14,873	11,421	454,636	125.49	30.57	+.3	+.9	+9.1	+12.8
Nev.....	1,203	4,776	3,771	150,869	125.41	31.59	+.4	+1.3	-1.6	+4.9
N. H.....	1,054	4,354	3,251	188,590	178.93	43.31	-1.1	-1.1	+3.7	+9.6
N. J.....	24,912	98,197	74,230	4,750,864	190.71	48.38	+1.0	+1.5	+11.3	+12.7
N. Mex. 4/....	7,674	31,380	23,769	1,030,836	134.33	32.85	+.6	+5.3	+4.4	+5.1
N. Y. 3/.....	114,410	498,444	364,321	22,562,058	197.20	45.26	+.1	+1.9	+12.6	+20.0
N. C. 4/.....	28,238	117,822	87,890	2,827,478	100.13	24.00	+.5	+.9	-1.9	+2.0
N. Dak.....	1,810	7,168	5,496	310,901	171.77	43.37	+3.5	+8.4	+4.9	+8.5
Ohio 3/.....	40,473	167,538	124,934	5,243,437	129.55	31.30	+7.3	+7.8	+9.2	+14.2
Okla. 3/ 4/...	18,759	73,670	54,576	2,550,637	135.97	34.62	(6/)	-.6	+3.8	+11.7
Oreg. 3/ 4/...	8,051	32,180	23,612	1,206,936	149.91	37.51	-.5	-1.1	-3.2	-5.4
Pa. 3/.....	73,828	330,093	233,638	9,385,315	127.12	28.43	-1.4	-2.1	-8.5	-8.6
P. R.....	51,725	208,443	166,646	755,401	14.60	3.62	-.4	-.9	-6.2	-7.3
R. I. 3/.....	5,898	24,153	17,623	966,685	163.90	40.02	-.8	-.2	+9.6	+11.9
S. C.....	7,926	31,796	25,456	530,579	66.94	16.69	-1.0	+1.6	-7.4	-5.9
S. Dak.....	2,802	10,219	7,793	311,277	111.09	30.46	+1.2	+1.6	+1.1	-9.6
Tenn. 4/.....	19,524	77,246	58,190	1,539,239	78.84	19.93	+.2	-.4	-4.9	+1.5
Tex.....	19,222	87,809	66,364	1,567,875	81.57	17.86	-.6	-.5	+13.2	+6.7
Utah 3/ 4/....	5,025	21,243	15,277	717,612	142.81	33.78	-2.5	+4.4	+8.9	+6.3
Vt.....	1,411	5,358	3,929	160,332	113.63	29.92	+1.5	+1.3	+8.4	+7.0
V. I.....	321	1,082	891	20,043	62.44	18.52	-9.5	-1.4	+6.0	+18.3
Va. 4/.....	10,776	45,715	35,112	1,093,602	101.48	23.92	-.1	-.1	+1.4	+2.4
Wash. 3/ 4/...	17,903	72,982	52,079	2,727,284	152.34	37.37	-.8	+1.9	+66.1	+46.2
W. Va. 3/ 4/..	27,004	124,056	85,132	3,327,128	123.21	26.82	-1.0	-.5	-10.5	-6.7
Wis. 4/.....	11,452	44,902	33,760	2,135,245	186.45	47.55	+.7	+.7	+3.8	+3.7
Wyo.....	884	3,405	2,635	133,357	150.86	39.17	+.7	+1.7	+2.9	+6.1

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Includes as recipients the children and 1 or both parents or 1 caretaker relative other than a parent in families in which the requirements of such adults were considered in determining the amount of assistance. 3/ Includes data on unemployed-parent segment; see table 8. 4/ Includes data on foster-family care; see table 9. 5/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent. 6/ Increase of less than 0.05 percent. 7/ Data for March; April data not available.

Table 8. Aid to families with dependent children, unemployed-parent segment: Recipients and payments to recipients, April 1964 1/

[Includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of families	Number of recipients		Payments to recipients			Percentage change from--			
					Average per--		March 1964 in--		April 1963 in--	
		Total 2/	Children	Total	Family	Recipient	Number of recipients	Amount	Number of recipients	Amount
Total..	78,282	449,516	300,924	$14,069,963	$179.73	$31.30	+8.2	+4.6	+26.9	+33.1
Calif.....	12,461	72,667	50,522	2,846,325	228.42	39.17	+25.8	+18.8	(3/)	(3/)
Conn.....	2,656	14,538	9,470	570,872	214.94	39.27	+.8	+17.9	+7.2	+41.3
Del.....	555	3,337	2,309	72,160	130.02	21.62	-9.4	-11.2	+7.2	+5.2
Hawaii....	362	2,243	1,553	62,967	173.94	28.07	-.4	-8.9	-8.9	-3.4
Ill.....	8,549	54,024	37,291	2,177,660	254.73	40.31	-5.3	-6.1	-16.3	-18.1
Kans.....	437	2,551	1,699	77,516	177.38	30.39	-1.8	-8.1	(3/)	(3/)
Md.....	601	3,681	2,507	105,049	174.79	28.54	-14.2	-16.3	-7.9	-8.5
Mass.....	762	4,292	2,874	145,444	190.87	33.89	-1.5	+1.4	+48.7	+25.6
Mich.....	3,313	20,890	14,307	354,234	106.92	16.96	(4/)	(4/)	(4/)	(4/)
N. Y.....	17,367	99,981	67,163	3,205,793	184.59	32.06	-1.1	-5.2	+9.6	+13.5
Ohio.....	1,828	10,214	6,846	280,589	153.50	27.47	(4/)	(4/)	(4/)	(4/)
Okla.....	28	162	110	4,418	(5/)	(5/)	+29.6	+16.4	-31.9	-33.6
Oreg.....	1,139	6,409	4,416	232,409	204.05	36.26	-5.2	-5.7	+7.9	+9.1
Pa.....	11,254	61,512	39,661	1,434,378	127.45	23.32	-5.7	-7.5	-29.1	-29.1
R. I.....	753	4,199	2,754	140,209	186.20	33.39	-5.8	-6.2	+11.6	+12.9
Utah.....	1,127	6,232	4,212	113,113	100.37	18.15	-5.5	-1.9	+21.5	+10.0
Wash.....	3,447	19,672	12,840	536,890	155.76	27.29	-6.5	-8.0	(3/)	(3/)
W. Va.....	11,643	62,912	40,390	1,709,937	146.86	27.18	-1.5	-.5	-10.6	-7.3

1/ Data for this segment of the program, shown separately here, are included in table 7. All data subject to revision. 2/ Includes as recipients the children and 1 or both parents or 1 caretaker relative other than a parent in families in which the requirements of such adults were considered in determining the amount of assistance. 3/ No program in operation April 1963. 4/ Program initiated April 1964. 5/ Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 families.

Table 9. Aid to families with dependent children receiving foster care: Recipients and payments for foster care, by State, April 1964 1/

State	Number of--				Payments for foster care			
	Children receiving foster care			Families from which children were removed	Total amount	Average per child	In foster homes	In institutions
	Total	In foster homes	In institutions					
Total.....	4,787	2/ 3,763	2/ 150	1,999	$397,792	$83.10	2/ $241,431	2/ $21,556
Ala.....	16	16	0	7	542	(3/)	542	0
Alaska.....	26	26	0	10	3,175	(3/)	3,175	0
Ariz.....	149	149	0	54	7,059	47.38	7,059	0
Calif.....	990	901	89	476	89,759	90.67	74,063	15,696
Ill.....	874	(2/)	(2/)	355	134,805	154.24	(2/)	(2/)
Ind.....	95	95	0	32	3,692	38.86	3,692	0
Kans.....	64	55	9	34	5,747	89.80	4,811	936
Ky.....	6	6	0	2	420	(3/)	420	0
La.....	387	373	14	161	24,585	63.53	23,192	1,393
Md.....	349	335	14	124	24,983	71.58	23,863	1,120
Mich.....	27	26	1	13	1,552	(3/)	1,432	120
Minn.....	157	148	9	75	12,582	80.14	10,976	1,606
Mo.....	44	44	0	13	1,390	(3/)	1,390	0
N. Mex.....	58	58	0	23	3,254	56.10	3,254	0
N. C.....	39	39	0	9	1,681	(2/)	1,681	0
Okla.....	284	284	0	114	12,518	44.08	12,518	0
Oreg.....	134	134	0	55	8,449	63.05	8,449	0
Tenn.....	168	162	6	58	10,969	65.29	10,609	360
Utah.....	201	201	0	86	10,112	50.31	10,112	0
Va.....	37	37	0	11	1,530	(3/)	1,530	0
Wash.....	460	460	0	194	25,571	55.59	25,571	0
W. Va.....	49	41	8	22	2,570	(3/)	2,245	325
Wis.....	173	173	0	71	10,847	62.70	10,847	0

1/ Data for this segment of the program, shown separately here, are included in Table 7. All data subject to revision. 2/ Excludes Illinois; breakdown not available. 3/ Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 children.

Table 10. General assistance: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, April 1964 1/

/Excludes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments/

State	Number of--		Payments to recipients			Percentage change from--			
				Average per--		March 1964 in--		April 1963 in--	
	Cases	Recipients	Total amount	Case	Recipient	Number of recipients	Amount	Number of recipients	Amount
Total 2/.....	359,000	843,000	$24,097,000	$67.13	$28.59	-7.8	-4.2	-10.0	-4.4
Ala.....	80	88	1,058	13.23	12.02	(3/)	(3/)	-17.0	-19.4
Alaska.....	228	703	14,588	63.98	20.75	-16.6	-19.5	+7.2	+3.0
Ariz.....	2,316	6,002	120,273	51.93	20.04	+2.1	+3.6	-.2	-22.3
Ark.....	384	1,453	5,880	15.31	4.05	+19.8	+40.5	-.2	+3.0
Calif.....	28,913	60,401	1,578,875	54.61	26.14	-20.3	-4.8	-39.0	-30.4
Colo.....	2,161	8,036	104,581	48.39	13.01	-15.2	-15.9	+14.1	+23.6
Conn.....	4/ 4,319	4/ 9,994	4/ 284,354	65.84	28.45	-9.0	-6.5	-11.6	-6.4
Del.....	1,761	3,055	93,952	53.35	30.75	-1.3	-2.0	+18.5	+14.3
Dist. of Col....	626	684	46,554	74.37	68.06	+.4	-.9	-12.5	-13.0
Fla. 5/.....	9,000	(6/)	251,000	---	---	---	---	---	---
Ga.....	2,518	5,770	77,617	30.82	13.45	-10.4	-3.4	-2.7	+2.6
Guam 7/.....	12	24	429	(3/)	(3/)	---	---	---	---
Hawaii.....	1,108	1,425	75,093	67.77	52.70	+1.6	+1.8	-6.7	+12.7
Ill.....	29,974	64,698	2,439,075	81.37	37.70	-4.5	-.5	+3.5	+3.8
Iowa 5/.....	4,400	10,900	179,000	---	---	---	---	---	---
Kans.....	3,162	7,955	206,739	65.38	25.99	-8.7	-5.8	-18.2	-11.1
Ky.....	1,609	5,039	58,067	36.09	11.52	-18.0	-21.1	+23.6	-39.2
La.....	8,218	9,101	427,678	52.04	46.99	+2.1	+1.6	+6.7	+6.8
Maine.....	3,180	11,482	159,025	50.01	13.85	-2.7	-1.8	-10.1	-7.9
Md.....	6,228	7,055	449,336	72.15	63.69	+3.2	+3.1	+18.5	+21.1
Mass.....	8,248	17,463	642,104	77.85	36.77	-7.5	+2.7	+8.5	+25.6
Mich.....	28,497	92,348	2,683,787	94.18	29.06	-9.9	-11.8	-28.1	-27.7
Minn.....	11,865	36,227	1,026,564	86.52	28.34	-4.0	-3.1	+6.7	+14.4
Miss.....	1,183	1,579	17,667	14.93	11.19	+.6	+4.0	+.8	+12.9
Mo.....	9,782	13,045	649,213	66.37	49.77	-2.2	+.2	-2.7	+1.1
Mont.....	2,335	7,964	102,303	43.81	12.85	-10.3	-10.9	+20.9	+21.0
Nev.....	346	682	20,488	59.21	30.04	-13.0	-11.4	+33.7	+9.4
N. H.....	1,195	4,189	78,020	65.29	18.62	-2.2	-1.6	+4.6	+3.6
N. J. 8/.....	11,113	37,465	1,352,951	121.74	36.11	-10.4	-8.1	+4.5	+5.0
N. Mex.....	771	1,169	29,035	37.66	24.84	-2.3	+4.5	+31.2	+36.0
N. Y. 9/.....	43,686	95,222	3,561,744	81.53	37.40	-.1	-.4	+18.9	+26.1
N. C.....	1,898	5,496	41,605	21.92	7.57	-22.2	-17.1	-8.6	-15.4
N. Dak.....	555	2,478	36,025	64.91	14.54	-13.2	-18.4	+10.3	+19.8
Ohio.....	31,689	111,686	2,348,848	74.12	21.03	-9.6	-9.4	-19.5	-17.0
Okla.....	7,629	(6/)	99,101	12.99	---	---	-12.6	---	-6.9
Oreg.....	4,953	(6/)	281,230	56.78	---	---	-14.9	---	-26.1
Pa.....	39,144	47,273	2,310,234	59.02	48.87	-1.3	-1.4	-5.6	-4.5
P. R.....	1,556	1,556	12,510	8.04	8.04	+30.8	+44.1	+41.1	+54.4
R. I.....	3,031	6,730	204,120	67.34	30.33	+5.2	+22.6	+24.5	+39.8
S. C.....	1,507	1,737	46,230	30.68	26.61	-4.8	-2.7	+6.7	+3.1
S. Dak.....	565	2,019	21,647	38.31	10.72	-1.2	+8.5	+38.7	+38.6
Tenn.....	2,075	5,043	43,426	20.93	8.61	-14.3	-5.8	-17.4	+20.3
Tex. 7/ 10/.....	10,000	(6/)	285,000	---	---	---	---	---	---
Utah.....	1,990	5,842	159,822	80.31	27.36	-4.1	+7.6	+35.0	+49.3
Vt. 10/.....	1,300	(6/)	51,000	---	---	---	---	---	---
V. I.....	174	180	5,245	30.14	29.14	+7.1	+2.2	+5.9	+1.5
Va.....	2,934	8,062	139,881	47.68	17.35	-7.8	+3.9	+.8	+10.5
Wash.....	8,569	14,348	578,227	67.48	40.30	-7.9	-6.1	-39.9	-25.4
W. Va.....	1,430	2,536	53,171	37.18	20.97	+1.3	+1.9	+.6	+12.9
Wis.....	9,145	29,188	907,535	99.24	31.09	-4.5	-1.8	-1.9	+4.0
Wyo.....	617	2,475	50,560	81.94	20.43	-18.1	-18.8	+26.0	+28.4

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Partly estimated; does not represent sum of State figures because totals exclude for New Jersey an estimated number of cases and persons receiving only medical care, hospitalization, and/or burial and payments for such services; recipient count also includes an estimate for States not reporting such data. Excludes Idaho, Indiana, and Nebraska; data not available. 3/ Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 recipients; percentage change on fewer than 100 recipients. 4/ About 4 percent of this total is estimated. 5/ Partly estimated. 6/ Data not available. 7/ Data for March; data for April not available. 8/ Includes an unknown number of cases and persons receiving only medical care, hospitalization, and/or burial, and total payments for such services. 9/ Includes an unknown number of cases and persons receiving only medical care. 10/ Estimated on basis of reports from sample of local jurisdictions.

Table 11. Amount of vendor payments for medical care for recipients of public assistance, by program and State, April 1964 1/

State	Old-age assistance	Medical assistance for the aged	Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled	Aid to families with dependent children	General assistance
Total.....	$37,035,364	$36,532,021	$966,003	$9,664,659	$11,950,440	2/ $9,114,000
Ala.....	1,052,518	72,146	3,956	60,963	420	21
Alaska 3/.....	18,730	---	---	4,457	---	---
Ariz.....	58,767	---	---	---	---	---
Ark.....	678,961	128,345	17,702	185,091	39,748	27,855
Calif.....	3,636,132	7,973,416	179,280	988,275	1,068,610	143,215
Colo.....	921,443	---	4,732	91,801	105,232	95,530
Conn.....	235,860	4/ 1,303,183	17,162	305,843	564,591	(5/)
Del.....	24,047	---	1,362	---	---	---
D. C.....	51,394	93,811	362	11,460	1,268	235
Fla. 3/.....	1,234,623	197,660	22,267	238,863	60,799	---
Ga.....	726,382	---	7,033	120,542	---	---
Guam 6/.....	615	2,276	---	---	---	---
Hawaii 3/.....	11,476	130,602	1,367	47,768	50,152	26,663
Idaho.....	52,072	251,210	235	20,601	---	---
Ill. 3/.....	2,609,676	454,917	77,970	792,775	1,519,827	7/ 787,200
Ind.....	829,824	---	40,498	68,910	236,577	---
Iowa.....	963,053	287,500	12,820	---	165,270	7/ 8/ 260,000
Kans.....	293,468	4/ 311,676	5,121	63,883	98,901	63,973
Ky. 3/.....	631,985	236,937	17,134	143,543	201,196	---
La.....	2,141,953	121,632	6,090	89,491	17,597	4,074
Maine 3/.....	345,960	110,131	4,036	41,144	27,575	96,328
Md. 3/.....	96,218	365,169	3,952	74,858	---	1,547
Mass.....	1,168,000	4/ 4,502,490	33,649	903,770	569,197	218,392
Mich.....	749,697	1,942,499	19,717	188,438	196,227	395,520
Minn.....	2,973,825	---	49,841	44,967	362,588	378,474
Miss.....	143,950	---	3,386	---	---	---
Mo.....	863,409	---	---	33,997	38,225	14,261
Mont.....	1,449	---	604	215	119	7/ 379,670
Nebr.....	601,056	---	31,746	111,695	37,712	---
Nev.....	55,672	---	3,277	(9/)	9,274	7/ 240,056
N. H.....	96,566	53,674	5,100	20,040	31,389	(5/)
N. J.....	263,719	4/ 1,277,380	10,817	223,315	263,793	315,616
N. Mex. 3/.....	171,915	---	5,580	58,620	94,161	15,689
N. Y.....	1,274,887	4/ 11,276,414	102,900	2,003,000	3,136,438	296,359
N. C.....	379,569	---	24,551	247,571	223,496	7/ 136,199
N. Dak.....	127,539	4/ 229,985	1,050	75,353	60,315	7/ 28,341
Ohio.....	1,708,833	---	49,974	283,151	442,016	7/ 1,764,013
Okla. 3/.....	1,500,048	152,974	30,420	229,536	185,810	(5/)
Oreg.....	131,798	506,215	4,517	142,258	72,113	62,431
Pa.....	703,353	1,989,009	68,381	260,679	410,776	138,505
P. R.....	26,729	98,122	---	---	---	---
R. I. 3/.....	92,520	---	1,530	48,224	142,503	7/ 68,836
S. C.....	377,918	220,620	15,375	103,242	46,836	18,582
S. Dak.....	98,780	---	---	---	---	7/ 126,045
Tenn.....	455,537	250,283	3,832	21,292	35,123	---
Tex.....	2,769,883	---	---	---	---	---
Utah.....	69,870	251,271	3,503	134,225	112,516	2,618
Vt. 3/.....	198,997	31,473	2,002	21,837	---	---
V. I.....	1,422	3,225	4	91	160	155
Va.....	234,766	106,973	12,506	75,698	48,038	7/ 20,725
Wash.....	788,896	1,427,768	15,781	576,752	508,284	---
W. Va.....	162,767	161,126	4,980	68,398	454,981	12,661
Wis.....	2,185,585	---	37,230	427,482	298,695	296,278
Wyo.....	41,252	9,909	671	10,545	11,892	44,794

1/ For State programs not shown, no vendor payments were made during the month or such payments were not reported. 2/ Includes an estimated amount for States making vendor payments for medical care from general assistance funds and from special medical funds and reporting these data semiannually but not on a monthly basis. 3/ Except for aid to families with dependent children and general assistance, data represent payments for recipients of the specified type of assistance under program for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 4/ Includes money payments not subject to Federal participation as follows: $883 in Connecticut, $10,566 in Kansas, $101,300 in Massachusetts, $8,254 in New Jersey, $52,276 in New York, and $2,243 in North Dakota. 5/ Data not available. 6/ Data for March; April data not available. 7/ Includes payments made in behalf of recipients of the special types of public assistance. 8/ Partly estimated. 9/ No program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

Table 12. Average payment per recipient for all assistance, for money payments, and for vendor payments for medical care, by program and State, April 1964 1/

State	Old-age assistance			Medical assistance for the aged	Aid to the blind			Aid to the permanently and totally disabled			Aid to families with dependent children (per recipient)		
	All assistance	Money payments to recipients	Vendor payments for medical care		All assistance	Money payments to recipients	Vendor payments for medical care	All assistance	Money payments to recipients	Vendor payments for medical care	All assistance	Money payments to recipients	Vendor payments for medical care
Total.....	$78.40	$61.46	$16.94	$207.08	$83.66	$73.76	$9.89	$78.32	$58.75	$19.57	$32.75	$29.94	$2.80
Ala.....	68.14	58.54	9.60	278.56	57.78	55.51	2.27	45.95	41.70	4.25	11.72	11.71	(2/)
Alaska.....	82.40	68.89	13.51	---	76.48	76.48	---	95.91	64.30	31.61	34.58	34.58	---
Ariz.....	63.12	58.72	4.40	---	72.40	72.40	---	67.44	67.44	---	28.55	28.55	---
Ark.....	61.69	49.96	11.73	50.35	67.06	58.11	8.95	57.05	36.86	20.19	16.92	15.55	1.37
Calif.....	108.26	94.91	13.35	295.34	130.25	115.97	14.28	113.75	92.60	21.14	44.73	42.54	2.20
Colo.....	101.01	82.19	18.81	---	86.77	68.35	18.41	74.37	59.15	15.21	36.99	34.39	2.60
Conn.....	89.74	60.01	29.74	216.19	113.54	59.40	54.14	81.01	38.10	42.91	50.03	40.35	9.68
Del.....	71.25	51.76	19.49	---	80.77	76.16	4.62	73.24	73.24	---	21.91	21.91	---
D. C.....	84.40	62.90	21.50	303.60	73.42	71.58	1.84	76.83	73.04	3.79	32.79	32.72	.07
Fla. 3/.....	66.33	49.09	17.24	388.33	67.79	59.13	8.66	70.76	55.73	15.03	16.07	15.48	.59
Ga.....	55.68	47.77	7.91	---	57.86	55.64	2.22	58.91	54.23	4.67	22.80	22.80	---
Guam 4/.....	30.25	26.54	3.70	17.51	(5/)	(5/)	---	25.90	25.90	---	12.99	12.99	---
Hawaii 3/.....	66.72	56.72	10.00	261.20	91.74	74.65	17.09	112.45	67.17	45.28	33.84	30.27	3.57
Idaho.....	72.71	61.78	10.93	133.62	74.04	72.26	1.78	56.84	49.25	7.60	39.26	39.26	---
Ill. 3/.....	88.01	43.70	44.30	461.38	89.87	59.77	30.10	92.90	64.55	28.35	44.15	38.50	5.64
Ind.....	80.09	44.35	35.74	---	84.05	61.37	22.69	115.31	46.67	68.64	29.25	24.33	4.92
Iowa.....	89.53	56.29	33.23	117.49	101.82	91.28	10.54	82.54	82.54	---	38.43	34.38	4.05
Kans.....	82.64	69.40	13.24	162.16	85.26	75.16	10.10	103.25	89.04	14.22	36.65	33.73	2.92
Ky. 3/.....	62.17	50.98	11.19	34.27	70.85	63.80	7.05	77.27	62.62	14.65	25.07	22.46	2.60
La.....	84.83	68.36	16.47	211.17	81.19	79.03	2.16	57.75	52.99	4.76	23.12	22.95	.17
Maine 3/.....	84.14	53.15	30.99	245.28	85.06	73.56	11.50	88.32	69.82	18.50	29.09	27.71	1.38
Md. 3/.....	72.87	62.74	10.13	35.61	80.03	70.25	9.78	77.96	67.68	10.28	32.56	32.56	---
Mass.....	91.90	70.60	21.30	173.51	136.55	121.74	14.81	145.82	67.78	78.05	49.30	42.85	6.44
Mich.....	84.96	69.97	14.99	369.79	86.80	75.09	11.72	106.13	80.80	25.33	34.08	32.79	1.29
Minn.....	111.32	42.40	68.93	---	111.76	65.52	46.23	60.91	47.67	13.25	50.41	42.71	7.70
Miss.....	39.14	37.20	1.94	---	44.50	43.37	1.13	43.55	43.55	---	10.61	10.61	---
Mo.....	66.94	58.62	8.31	---	75.00	75.00	---	69.66	67.32	2.34	24.06	23.70	.36
Mont.....	71.91	71.65	.26	---	84.61	82.32	2.29	78.64	78.47	.17	35.07	35.05	.02
Nebr.....	90.03	42.44	47.58	---	102.43	55.04	47.38	93.69	48.24	45.44	30.57	28.03	2.54
Nev.....	89.06	67.27	21.79	---	116.07	96.57	19.51	(6/)	(6/)	(6/)	31.59	29.65	1.94
N. H.....	100.94	79.32	21.62	46.71	103.97	84.05	19.92	113.50	78.35	35.16	43.31	36.10	7.21
N. J.....	80.06	61.21	18.85	247.70	87.05	75.62	11.42	94.26	67.26	27.00	48.38	45.69	2.69
N. Mex. 3/.....	74.26	58.32	15.94	---	90.76	74.29	16.46	85.60	69.07	16.52	32.85	29.85	3.00
N. Y.....	93.80	71.21	22.59	326.36	113.43	81.24	32.20	127.55	70.54	57.01	45.26	38.97	6.29
N. C.....	59.03	50.35	8.68	---	65.47	60.61	4.85	69.26	57.77	11.49	24.00	22.10	1.90
N. Dak.....	84.99	61.60	23.39	218.82	78.82	65.53	13.29	115.08	62.20	52.88	43.37	34.96	8.41
Ohio.....	85.15	65.11	20.04	---	84.72	69.95	14.77	76.22	61.04	15.18	31.30	28.66	2.64
Okla. 3/.....	95.85	77.87	17.98	150.86	121.78	103.74	18.03	110.37	92.55	17.82	34.62	32.10	2.52
Oreg.....	67.91	56.31	11.60	142.92	83.85	72.81	11.04	63.16	44.79	18.37	37.51	35.26	2.24
Pa.....	77.24	62.30	14.95	243.07	74.87	71.04	3.83	66.12	52.83	13.29	28.43	27.19	1.24
P. R.....	9.29	8.47	.82	28.67	8.37	8.37	---	8.63	8.63	---	3.62	3.62	---
R. I. 3/.....	85.07	69.57	15.50	---	87.80	72.80	15.00	90.77	73.17	17.60	40.02	34.12	5.90
S. C.....	54.79	40.43	14.36	203.90	62.87	54.16	8.71	57.27	45.14	12.14	16.69	15.21	1.47
S. Dak.....	82.29	68.79	13.50	---	69.24	69.24	---	69.44	69.44	---	30.46	30.46	---
Tenn.....	52.27	42.34	9.93	49.60	51.95	50.25	1.70	50.11	48.41	1.70	19.93	19.47	.45
Tex.....	70.11	58.02	12.10	---	69.42	69.42	---	57.32	57.32	---	17.86	17.86	---
Utah.....	71.55	57.90	13.65	117.31	80.47	60.10	20.37	70.69	41.79	28.90	33.78	28.48	5.30
Vt. 3/.....	84.58	48.13	36.45	234.87	76.01	58.45	17.56	81.39	60.73	20.66	29.92	29.92	---
V. I.....	34.17	31.17	3.00	24.62	(5/)	(5/)	(5/)	33.52	32.52	1.00	18.52	18.38	.15
Va.....	62.01	44.53	17.48	179.48	68.36	57.50	10.86	66.06	54.71	11.35	23.92	22.87	1.05
Wash.....	85.25	62.09	23.16	143.67	94.82	71.16	23.66	64.17	32.79	31.38	37.37	30.40	6.96
W. Va.....	49.21	38.21	11.00	30.15	48.00	42.00	6.00	51.54	40.53	11.01	26.82	23.15	3.67
Wis.....	106.00	32.21	73.79	---	96.45	50.65	45.79	112.88	39.12	73.75	47.55	40.90	6.65
Wyo.....	85.10	68.91	16.19	(5/)	83.90	72.33	11.57	86.32	69.15	17.17	39.17	35.67	3.49

1/ Averages based on cases receiving money payments, vendor payments for medical care, or both. Money payments may also include small amounts for assistance in kind and vendor payments for other than medical care. Averages for general assistance not computed because of difference among States in policy or practice regarding use of general assistance funds to pay medical bills for recipients of the special types of public assistance. 2/ Less than 1 cent. 3/ Except for aid to families with dependent children, data for each program represent average payments for recipients of the specified type of assistance under program for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 4/ Data for March; April data not available. 5/ Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 recipients. 6/ No program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

Old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits, summary data, April 1964

CURRENT MONTH DATA

Type of benefit	Benefits awarded during month		Benefits in current-payment status, end of month			Amount of benefits paid 1/ during month (in thousands)
	Number	Average amount	Number	Monthly rate (in thousands)	Average amount	
Total, OASI and DI	341,559	---	---	---	---	$1,354,441
Total, OASI	304,883	---	---	---	---	1,246,416
Monthly benefits, OASI and DI	242,143	---	19,392,456	$1,289,767	---	1,334,478
Monthly benefits, OASI	205,467	---	17,897,800	1,193,682	---	1,226,453
Monthly benefits, DI	36,676	---	1,494,656	96,085	---	108,025
Old-age (retired-worker)	102,758	$79.73	10,449,652	807,471	$77.27	823,014
Disability (disabled-worker)	18,551	95.11	849,897	77,141	90.77	86,185
Wife's or husband's (OASI and DI)	36,754	38.56	2,773,783	109,846	39.60	114,383
Wife's or husband's (OASI)	31,453	39.23	2,601,130	104,292	40.10	107,892
Wife's or husband's (DI)	5,301	34.63	172,653	5,554	32.17	6,491
Widow's or widower's	25,210	72.42	2,062,875	138,619	67.20	143,908
Parent's	349	81.76	36,690	2,549	69.47	2,833
Child's (OASI and DI)	49,034	---	2,751,930	126,441	---	134,444
Child's (OASI--total)	36,210	---	2,279,824	113,052	---	119,095
Child's (OASI--life) 2/	10,530	27.91	426,163	11,957	28.06	12,612
Child's (OASI--survivor) 2/	25,680	53.11	1,853,661	101,095	54.54	106,483
Child's (DI)	12,824	28.98	472,106	13,389	28.36	15,349
Mother's	9,487	61.30	467,629	27,700	59.23	29,711
Lump-sum death payments	99,416	3/212.11	---	---	---	19,963

COMPARATIVE DATA

Item	April 1964	March 1964	April 1963
Number of benefits in current-payment status, end of month:			
Total, OASI and DI	19,392,456	19,303,647	18,451,768
Total, OASI	17,897,800	17,824,823	17,103,504
Total, DI	1,494,656	1,478,824	1,348,264
Amount of benefits paid (in thousands):			
Total, OASI and DI	$1,354,441	$1,348,210	$1,284,484
Total, OASI	1,246,416	1,241,905	1,185,124
Total, DI	108,025	106,304	99,360
Number of old-age (retired-worker) benefits:			
Awarded	102,758	105,239	103,805
In current-payment status, end of month	10,449,652	10,408,904	9,951,795
Average old-age (retired-worker) benefit:			
Awarded	$79.73	$80.64	$79.49
In current-payment status, end of month	77.27	77.22	76.59
Number of disability insurance (disabled-worker) benefits:			
Awarded	18,551	17,865	18,355
In current-payment status, end of month	849,897	841,723	773,951
Average disability insurance (disabled-worker) benefit:			
Awarded	$95.11	$95.26	$94.13
In current-payment status, end of month	90.77	90.71	90.20
Number of persons aged 62 and over receiving monthly benefits, end of month (OASI and DI) 4/	15,170,000	15,111,000	14,466,000
Number of persons aged 65 and over receiving monthly benefits, end of month (OASI and DI) 4/	13,331,000	13,295,000	12,736,000
Assets of trust funds, end of month (in millions):			
OASI	$18,129	$18,437	$17,694
DI	2,154	2,187	2,293

1/ Exceeds monthly amount of benefits in current-payment status because initial payments include amounts payable for prior months. Distribution by type of monthly benefit estimated.
2/ Distribution by type of claim for OASI child's benefits estimated.
3/ Average lump-sum per worker; 94,119 deceased workers represented in the current month's lump-sum awards.
4/ Numbers estimated to the nearest thousand.

Source: Division of the Actuary, Social Security Administration.

WTPLEC-3022
BOSTON UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
SERIALS DEPARTMENT
705 COMMONWEALTH AVE
BOSTON 15 MASS

DEP
EALTH, EDUCA
Welfare Administration
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20201

OFFICIAL BUSINESS